

seventy-one thousand six hundred," so as to make the clause read:

Expenses of providing all such stationery, blanks, record and other books, seals, presses, flags, signs, rent (allowance for rent not to exceed in any case 30 per cent of the officer's salary), postage, furniture, including typewriters and exchange of same, statistics, newspapers, freight (foreign and domestic), telegrams, advertising, messenger service, traveling expenses of consular officers and consular assistants, compensation of Chinese writers, loss by exchange, and such other miscellaneous expenses as the President may think necessary for the several consulates and consular agencies in the transaction of their business, \$471,000.

Mr. CURTIS. This gives the department the amount of their estimate. Last year they used \$50,486 more than was allowed by the House. They used \$450,000 and over last year, and the Secretary in his letter to the committee says that, in his judgment, it is absolutely necessary to have this amount for the coming year.

Mr. BACON. I should like to ask the Senator whether in that paragraph there are detailed estimates for these various items or whether it is all lumped together just as it is here.

Mr. CURTIS. Of course we had it from the House only. My recollection is that it is a lump estimate, but in the hearings before the House committee the matter was gone into very exhaustively and the expenditures were explained very fully.

Mr. BACON. I should like to ask the Senator whether there was any evidence brought before the Senate committee that was not before the House committee; and I will state afterwards my reason for making the inquiry.

Mr. CURTIS. There was simply a letter calling the chairman's attention to the fact that this amount had been reduced. If the Senator desires, I will read to the Senate that part of the Secretary's letter.

Mr. BACON. I have no doubt the letter is to the effect that there has been a reduction and that the full amount is needed. If so, it is not necessary to read the letter, but we will accept it as a statement from the Department of State.

I merely call attention to it for the purpose of repeating what I have frequently had occasion to say in the Senate in regard to these appropriation bills, that the complaint that is made about extravagance is one well founded, I think, and is largely due to the fact that appropriation bills are brought into the Senate with general appropriations of lump sums for two or three different items at one time and all in one paragraph, and all estimated for and appropriated for in one lump sum, under conditions where it is utterly impossible for Senators to judge whether the appropriations are properly made or not, and there is no opportunity for the exercise of judgment and discrimination in determining whether or not there can be any saving in regard to those amounts. So as to all the appropriation bills.

Take this particular paragraph. There are probably 12 or 15 items—typewriters, traveling expenses, and so forth—all mixed together and appropriated for in one lump sum. It is an utter impossibility for any man to put his finger upon any item and say that the appropriation for that purpose is too large. The consequence is we have to swallow it whole and suffer from subsequent indigestion.

I should like to ask the Senator what is the total amount of the increase in this bill over the bill as it was passed by the House?

Mr. CURTIS. \$369,556.

Mr. BACON. I simply desired to have the amount stated. I did not have it at hand.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on agreeing to the amendment proposed by the Committee on Appropriations.

The amendment was agreed to.

The reading of the bill was concluded.

Mr. BURTON. I desire to offer an amendment.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The amendment will be stated.

The SECRETARY. On page 16, after line 11, insert:

For the contribution of the United States toward the maintenance of the Bureau of the Interparliamentary Union, for the promotion of international arbitration, at Brussels, Belgium, \$2,500.

Mr. CURTIS. In the absence of an explanation, I shall have to make a point of order against the amendment.

Mr. BURTON. I will state that we appropriated for this union in the year 1911 an equal amount. It is found in the diplomatic and consular appropriation bill for that year, on page 10:

For contribution by the United States toward the maintenance of the Bureau of the Interparliamentary Union for the promotion of international arbitration, \$2,500.

It is the same sum and in almost exactly the same language.

Again, in 1904, the Congress appropriated \$50,000 for their entertainment in this country. The union is made up, as is generally known, of members of legislative bodies of countries

having legislative bodies, and it has done a very salutary work. Members of the House and of the Senate belong to the union.

Mr. CURTIS. I withdraw the point of order.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, the amendment is agreed to.

The bill was reported to the Senate as amended, and the amendments were concurred in.

The amendments were ordered to be engrossed and the bill to be read a third time.

The bill was read the third time and passed.

Mr. CURTIS. I move that the Senate adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 5 o'clock and 27 minutes p. m.) the Senate adjourned until to-morrow, Saturday, April 13, 1912, at 2 o'clock p. m.

## HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES.

FRIDAY, April 12, 1912.

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

The Chaplain, Rev. Henry N. Couden, D. D., offered the following prayer:

Our Father in heaven, we thank Thee for every great thought spoken or written, for every heroic deed enacted, for every spiritual uplift which has made for the betterment of mankind; and we pray most fervently that Thy spirit may come in all fullness and power to possess our minds and hearts that we may add somewhat to the world's progress and so fulfill the law and the prophets, in Jesus Christ, our Lord. Amen.

The Journal of the proceedings of yesterday was read and approved.

### CONTINGENT FUND DISBURSEMENT.

Mr. LLOYD. Mr. Speaker, I ask for the present consideration of the following privileged resolution from the Committee on Accounts.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the resolution.

The Clerk read as follows:

House resolution 474 (H. Rept. 537).

*Resolved*, That the sum of \$7,500 shall be paid out of the contingent fund of the House of Representatives, on vouchers ordered by the Committee on Expenditures in the Interior Department or any subcommittee thereof, for the purpose of taking testimony in their investigations, as authorized under House resolution 358, adopted January 9, 1912. That all vouchers ordered by said committee or any subcommittee of said committee shall be signed by the chairman of the committee thereof, approved by the Committee on Accounts, and evidenced by the signature of the chairman thereof.

The SPEAKER. The question is on agreeing to the resolution.

Mr. MANN. I wish the gentleman would give the reason for this.

Mr. LLOYD. Mr. Speaker, I yield five minutes to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. GRAHAM], chairman of the Committee on Expenditures in the Interior Department.

Mr. GRAHAM. Mr. Speaker, the purpose of the appropriation is to defray the expenses of a subcommittee to go down to Arizona and probably New Mexico to take testimony there with reference to the condition of some of the tribes of Indians in those States, and also with reference to reclamation projects in those States.

The reason for asking for the money to send the committee down there is merely for the purpose of economy. Some time ago the House appropriated for a subcommittee of this same committee to go to Minnesota. I have before me now some figures with reference to the expenses and the savings effected by going to Minnesota instead of bringing the witnesses to Washington. On that trip there were 21 witnesses called, who came from Minneapolis or points beyond it, who, if they had come to Washington, would have traveled in the aggregate 25,376 miles more than they did travel. Ten cents a mile on that would be \$2,537.60. There were two witnesses who came to Minneapolis from Oshkosh, Wis., and one from Wausau, Wis.

The saving on them by bringing them to Minneapolis instead of to Washington was \$235.80. The committee then went about 220 miles north of Minneapolis, to Detroit, because a great many of the witnesses needed lived near Detroit. Seventy-one witnesses were subpoenaed to that point. If they had come to Washington the aggregate additional mileage would have been 104,370 miles. At 10 cents a mile that would have aggregated \$10,437. That amount was saved by bringing them to Detroit instead of Washington. The total mileage which the committee thus saved aggregates thirteen thousand three hundred and some odd dollars.

Mr. MARTIN of South Dakota. Would the gentleman yield to me for a question?

Mr. GRAHAM. Certainly.

Mr. MARTIN of South Dakota. Did those 71 witnesses which the gentleman has referred to actually attend upon the hearings?

Mr. GRAHAM. They actually attended, but some of them were not called upon to testify.

Mr. MARTIN of South Dakota. How many of them were called upon to testify out of the 71?

Mr. GRAHAM. All of them but perhaps 15 witnesses who were called at the suggestion of Mr. Beaulieu, representing some Indian interests there. He asked that those witnesses be subpoenaed. The committee subpoenaed them, lest he should think he was discriminated against if they were not brought in.

Mr. MARTIN of South Dakota. In the other calculation there, in which the gentleman figured out a saving of \$325, how many witnesses were involved?

Mr. GRAHAM. Only three.

Mr. MARTIN of South Dakota. Did they attend and testify?

Mr. GRAHAM. Yes; they attended and testified. Then, on the other side of the account there are of course the personal expenses of the members of the subcommittee who went from Washington to Minneapolis. Only two members went. Mr. MONDELL could not go, and did not. The mileage and personal expenses of the committee, the two members who went, aggregated \$404.13, which, of course, ought to be taken from the other, leaving an aggregate saving of about \$12,800 effected by means of sending a small subcommittee to the witnesses instead of bringing the witnesses here.

Mr. MILLER. Will the gentleman yield for a question?

Mr. GRAHAM. Certainly.

Mr. MILLER. As I recall the resolution formerly reported and passed by the House, it authorized the committee to spend \$2,500. At that time I thought that was insufficient.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Illinois has expired.

Mr. LLOYD. Mr. Speaker, I yield five minutes' additional time to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. GRAHAM].

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Illinois [Mr. GRAHAM] is recognized for five minutes more.

Mr. MILLER. At that time I thought the amount was entirely insufficient if the committee intended to prosecute an exhaustive investigation of the subject matter.

I would also inquire of the gentleman if any of this \$7,500 reported by the resolution this morning is intended to be in payment of expenses incurred in the last trip to Minnesota?

Mr. GRAHAM. There will be a deficit in that. The expenses were more than \$2,500. But I would say, further answering that question, that the original amount of \$2,500 was not the suggestion of myself or anybody connected with the committee, and at that time the chairman was not aware that out of it would have to be paid stenographers' expenses and the expenses of a deputy sergeant at arms. The stenographers' fees alone will amount to about \$1,000.

Mr. MILLER. I will ask the gentleman if any of these 71 witnesses whom he has mentioned who appeared before the committee at Detroit and the twenty-odd who appeared before the committee at Minneapolis have had their mileage paid yet?

Mr. GRAHAM. The mileage has not been paid for the reason that the Clerk of the House refused to pro rate. He has not enough money to pay all of them, and he declines to begin pro rating. He thinks that would involve an unnecessary amount of trouble.

Mr. MILLER. I am sure the House wants the witnesses paid the legal amount. Can the gentleman inform us how much it would require in excess of the \$2,500 heretofore allowed to pay in full these unpaid claims for mileage due these witnesses?

Mr. GRAHAM. I can not accurately at this time, because the Clerk has been paying out of that \$2,500 expenses upon other matters than the White Earth matter. He has paid some other expenses which the committee incurred, treating that \$2,500 as a fund to the credit of the committee to defray expenses incurred from any source.

Mr. MILLER. Can the gentleman tell with reasonable accuracy how much would be required to pay these unpaid bills?

Mr. GRAHAM. At a mere guess, I should think a thousand dollars would be required. There will be that much expended in postage in answering inquiries from these witnesses if the bills are not paid soon.

Mr. HARDWICK. The gentleman will pardon me; if this resolution is passed, will there be enough to pay them?

Mr. GRAHAM. Yes.

Mr. MILLER. I assure the gentleman that I have no objection to that amount being given for the purpose. My only regret is that the original resolution did not provide specifically that a portion of this, at least, should go to pay the expense of the last investigation.

Mr. GRAHAM. Well, we did not think it necessary that it should so specify on its face.

Mr. MILLER. Can the gentleman state whether or not the proposed investigation of the Indians in the Southwest will incur a greater expense than the investigation in South Dakota and Minnesota?

Mr. GRAHAM. The expense of the committee will be greater than it was in our case, because the distance is greater. The traveling expenses will be more than ours. But my present information is that there will not be so many witnesses called as there were in the White Earth case, so that we could not make a very intelligent estimate in that regard, because, as these investigations go on, they widen out and you can not at the beginning tell just what ground you have to travel over before you get to the end.

Mr. MILLER. One more question. After this proposed investigation of Indian matters in the Southwest has been completed as contemplated by the resolution, has the gentleman in mind any other resolution contemplating additional investigations of Indian matters in other parts of the United States?

Mr. GRAHAM. When the original resolution was up the Crow Indians were spoken of, and the Crow question was one of the matters mentioned as being a subject for investigation. I am now of the opinion that the amount asked for would probably cover such an investigation; but as to what the future may bring forth, I do not pretend at this time to be able to say.

Mr. MILLER. The purpose of my inquiry is to ascertain if the gentleman is in a position to state whether or not he contemplates a general investigation of Indian matters throughout the United States, wherever he feels that the situation requires it.

Mr. GRAHAM. It may be impossible to foretell that. "The gentleman," like a great many others, will have to fight for his political scalp next fall.

Mr. MILLER. I understand the gentleman has been renominated by a handsome majority, and I do not suppose he will have any trouble from the poor Republicans down there.

Mr. GRAHAM. If the Republicans would treat me as well as the Democrats have—if I should have no more competition at the election than I had for the nomination—I might go into the investigation business more extensively; but I can not make any statement about it now.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Illinois has expired.

Mr. LLOYD. I yield to the gentleman from Illinois five minutes more.

Mr. GRAHAM. It is my present impression that beyond the possibility of an investigation of the Crow Indian affairs it would not be possible, even though the committee wished to do it, to go into anything else in the present session of Congress or before the beginning of the next session.

Mr. MILLER. I will simply state to the gentleman that at the outset, as he well knows, I was opposed to the investigation contemplated at that time, because I did not think it would produce any beneficial results. If it is the intention of the gentleman and his colleagues to have this committee investigate the Indian situation, I have no objection, but I think the appropriation should contemplate that and should be sufficiently large for that purpose. And rather than limit it to \$7,500, I for one think the amount ought to be increased by doubling it; because, if the committee is going into the general investigation business, it ought to go into it thoroughly and completely, and not leave unpaid accounts behind. I am frank to say that I have a large number of communications from dissatisfied Indians, who want to know what is the matter with Uncle Sam, who say that they paid their own expenses to go as witnesses and paid 25 cents to the notaries before whom they made their affidavits, and they have not been paid a dollar.

Mr. GRAHAM. They charged the quarter up to Uncle Sam, though, all of them.

Mr. MILLER. I do not think they ought to be put in that embarrassing position.

Mr. GRAHAM. I am glad I do not have to pay postage on my replies to all the inquiries I get about those witness fees.

Mr. HILL. When the gentleman began his remarks I understood that this money was to be used partly for an investigation of the reclamation projects in Arizona and New Mexico. Has the House authorized an investigation into the expenditure of the reclamation fund?

Mr. GRAHAM. As I understand it, it is not necessary that the House should specifically authorize it. The committee has authority under the rules of the House to do it.

Mr. HILL. Have any charges been made in regard to improper use of the funds or claiming unnecessary or extravagant expenditures?



Mr. GRAHAM. No formal charges; but the group of committees, of which this is one, do not have to wait for charges to be made. Their duty requires them to take the initiative, and not wait until charges have been made.

Mr. HILL. I understand that. Then the committee is acting purely on its own initiative and without any reason except the natural desire to know from personal observation whether the funds have been properly expended or not.

Mr. GRAHAM. That is not quite accurate. The committee have had many communications which have not been in the nature of formal charges, but have been in the nature of complaints and suggestions as to subjects that ought to be inquired into.

Mr. HILL. Have the committee made any attempt to verify the truth or the reasons for such complaints by inquiry of the department officials here in Washington?

Mr. GRAHAM. The committee have gone over a great deal of material in the department files with reference to these matters, and are of the opinion that some of the reclamation projects ought to be inquired into.

Mr. BURKE of South Dakota. Will my colleague on the committee yield for a suggestion? The gentleman from Connecticut [Mr. HILL] is undoubtedly laboring under the impression that this committee is investigating only expenditures in the Interior Department. As a matter of fact, this committee is investigating any subject under the Interior Department, from a reclamation project up to an Indian question; investigating questions of administration, questions of policy, and subjects that have no relation whatever to expenditures of money, although clearly under the rule that is all the committee can investigate; and I want to say to the gentleman that the committee is doing it against my protest as a minority member.

Mr. GRAHAM. In response to the remarks of my colleague on the committee, I want to say that he has persistently and consistently insisted that our committee had no jurisdiction to do anything but breathe.

Mr. HILL. I know nothing about the facts in this case; but it struck me as a singular proposition that if no complaint had been made and no charges had been brought, if the committee was simply dividing itself up into several committees and going around the country watching where expenditures have been made, that the ultimate logic of the situation would be that the House of Representatives would be divided into 150 or 200 smelling committees, looking to see how expenditures had been made all over the United States, and that unless there was some good reason for it that ought not to be done. I have full confidence in the chairman of the committee, in his integrity, in his honesty, efficiency, and good management, but I really think there ought to be some ground, some reason given, for taking \$7,500 out of the contingent fund of the House, aside from the fact that the committee, having good olfactory nerves, want to go around the country looking after the method of expenditures.

Mr. HARDWICK. Why does the gentleman call them smelling committees?

Mr. GRAHAM. Mr. Speaker, I will say, as I have said before, that without any special appropriation, under the rules of the House, this committee has the power to bring any number of witnesses from any part of the United States to Washington. We need no appropriation for that.

Mr. HILL. I suppose that is true of every one of the 10 committees.

Mr. GRAHAM. That is true of every one of the nine committees. But instead of exercising that power the committee was willing in this case, for the purpose of making a saving to the Treasury, as I have shown has been done, to take this method.

Mr. HILL. But the gentleman evades my point. I want to know if there is any necessity for the committee going to investigate these reclamation projects—if they have any ground for it?

Mr. GRAHAM. The gentleman misapprehends the purpose of the committee. Under the rule of the House one object is to find out whether there is any reason.

Mr. HILL. Can not that be done in Washington?

Mr. GRAHAM. Not very well.

Mr. HILL. Has the committee tried?

Mr. GRAHAM. We have.

Mr. HILL. And failed?

Mr. GRAHAM. No; but we have satisfied ourselves that such an investigation should be made, and so long as the committee believes that it ought to be made it should be made thoroughly and cheaply.

Mr. HILL. I agree with the gentleman.

Mr. GRAHAM. And we believe it can be made more thoroughly and more cheaply by sending three men down there.

Mr. HILL. Very well; I will vote for the resolution or any resolution that will take the entire membership of that side out of this Hall and allow us to transact business here. [Laughter.]

Mr. GRAHAM. I thank the gentleman for his compliment to me and to this side of the House, because this side of the House is well aware that the gentleman from Connecticut would be glad to get his hand into the pockets of the American people and rob them through a protective tariff, which he would be likely to do if this side of the House were vacant. [Laughter.]

Mr. LLOYD. Mr. Speaker, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MANN].

Mr. MANN. Mr. Speaker, I would like to inquire first whether, out of this resolution, there might be paid an amount for the services of the attorney who acted last summer for the committee.

Mr. GRAHAM. No. Does the gentleman understand?

Mr. MANN. I heard the answer, but I understood the gentleman to say that they might pay the expenses of the investigation which he has just been carrying on in addition to the amount which has heretofore been allowed. Hence I assume that the resolution, the terms of which I do not recollect, does not confine it to any particular expense.

Mr. GRAHAM. The resolution does not, but the law and the rules of the House do.

Mr. MANN. I am glad to know it.

Mr. GRAHAM. I am glad to be able to give the gentleman information.

Mr. MANN. Mr. Speaker, I doubt the propriety of sending any committee of the House away from Washington for any purpose, unless there be special reason for it. I think, as a rule, Members of the House ought to be here transacting the business for which they are elected.

There may be special reasons for this investigation. I do not know. When this committee went to make the investigation called the White Earth investigation I did not think that the chairman of that committee treated the minority fairly. There are three minority members upon the committee, and the chairman of the committee was notified that the gentleman from Wyoming [Mr. MONDELL] could not attend on the trip which the committee made to the Northwest, because his duties required him, in his opinion, to remain in the House, an opinion in which I concurred. I do not believe it is fair for the chairman of a committee appointing a subcommittee to purposely appoint as a minority member of that committee one who has notified him he can not attend. So much for that.

Mr. Speaker, I am informed that this committee has in its employ in some manner a lady named Mrs. Grey, and I presume from what I have been told that it is not the intention to pay Mrs. Grey out of this fund provided, although I do not know as to that; but I will ask the gentleman from Illinois whether, as a matter of fact, regardless of the sources of pay, Mrs. Grey has been doing work for the committee.

Mr. GRAHAM. Does the gentleman want an answer at this time?

Mr. MANN. Yes.

Mr. GRAHAM. A lady named Mrs. Grey has rendered the committee some service.

Mr. MANN. Mr. Speaker, this is an investigating committee, engaged in ascertaining not only whether money has been improperly expended, but at present engaged in ascertaining what ought to be the policy of the Government concerning Indian affairs—an investigation which really should be carried on by the Committee on Indian Affairs; but, practically having in its employ this lady, Mrs. Grey, with facilities for knowing what is going on in the committee, she has exercised the right of seeking employment outside to represent people who would be affected by the action of this committee.

The gentleman a moment ago said that one of the purposes of the committee had been to investigate the Crow Indians. This lady has protested to the Secretary of the Interior against the employment of other attorneys for the Crow Indians, and has signed herself the representative of the Crow Indians of Montana. She has obtained employment and received pay from other Indians interested in matters which are pending in the department and over which this committee has jurisdiction to act. She has not only received pay in some cases, but she has sought employment in other cases. I do not believe that an employee of the House of Representatives ought to be permitted to obtain pay to represent somebody in matters before the House of Representatives. I do not believe that an employee of a committee of the House ought to be permitted to solicit or receive

any employment to act in matters over which that committee has jurisdiction. It seems to me a greater outrage and scandal could not be submitted to Congress or to the House than for an employee of the House or an employee of a committee of the House to take pay to represent an outside party before the House or before that committee. Would anyone justify one of the regular employees of this House acting as a paid lobbyist before the House? Will anyone justify even a clerk of a Member of the House, not on the salary roll himself, taking employment to lobby in the House? Can anyone justify an employee of a committee of the House soliciting employment to represent outside parties before the committee of which he or she is an employee? I think it is due to the House, due to the committee, due to my colleague from Illinois, that all the actions of this lady be disavowed and that she be promptly discharged by the committee with a reprimand for acting as she has. [Applause on the Republican side.]

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Illinois has expired.

Mr. LLOYD. Mr. Speaker, I yield five minutes to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. GRAHAM].

Mr. GRAHAM. Mr. Speaker, I want first to answer my colleague's statement with reference to the personnel of the subcommittee which went to Minnesota. The gentleman's statement with reference to the manner of the selection of the gentleman from Wyoming, Mr. MONDELL, as a member of that committee has certainly been made under a misapprehension and does not conform to the facts. Mr. MONDELL was ranking member of the minority upon our committee. As ranking member the chairman of the committee understood that it was the custom, and that it was the right of Mr. MONDELL to be named as the minority member of the subcommittee. He was so named. At the time his name was informally mentioned as the minority member of the committee Mr. MONDELL said that he did not see how he could go, but he did not positively decline to go. He did later write a letter, not declining to serve, but tendering his resignation.

That letter reached me in Minneapolis, and I at once answered, regretting his determination not to act with us, and stating that I did not think I had any power individually to act upon that resignation, and that it would be presented to the full committee at the earliest practical moment. That was done, the resignation was withdrawn, and Mr. MONDELL is still a member of that subcommittee because he did not press his resignation. The gentleman who ranks next to him is now here. I call upon him, if he desires, to answer, to state whether he wanted to go or not. I think I violate no confidence in saying that he did not want to serve upon that subcommittee. He will be appointed as the minority member of the committee to go to Arizona, if such a committee is necessary and is justified by the action of the House.

There was no intention whatever to pick a member of the committee who would not or could not go. Far from it. We had hoped Mr. MONDELL would go, and we hope that the minority member appointed with this other subcommittee will go, as I am informed he will, if this committee is authorized to leave soon, because his affairs will permit him to go in that case, but not if the committee's going is delayed further. I know of no instance, Mr. Speaker, where the rule I have laid down has been violated—that is, the rule of seniority in the appointment of members of subcommittees—and as Mr. MONDELL was the ranking member of the committee with the minority, he was named the minority member of the subcommittee for that reason and no other.

Mr. MILLER. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GRAHAM. Certainly.

Mr. MILLER. I think this can probably be cleared up, and it ought to be cleared up even if it takes some additional time. Did not the gentleman know before he left the city of Washington to go to Minnesota that Mr. MONDELL would not serve on that committee?

Mr. GRAHAM. I did not know that he would not serve on the committee; he has since served notice that he would not, but I did believe that he would go to Minnesota.

Mr. MILLER. Does not the gentleman think, even if Mr. MONDELL was the ranking man, it was absolutely obligatory upon him, in view of the practice of the House, that he should have appointed the next ranking man, and, if he would not go, appoint the next ranking man?

Mr. GRAHAM. No; I do not agree with the gentleman in that regard. The chairman had no knowledge that anyone wanted to go; he had some knowledge that none wanted to go.

Mr. MILLER. Of course, nobody wanted to go unless it was the chairman of the committee, but they would have gone under

a sense of obligation to duty if their duties here had permitted. What I want to get from the gentleman is whether or not some Republican Member on that committee would have gone had he been appointed by the chairman.

Mr. GRAHAM. The chairman is unable to answer the question.

Mr. BURKE of South Dakota. Will the gentleman permit me to put a question to the chairman? I would like to ask the chairman of the committee whether or not informally the minority did not suggest to the chairman that they would confer and suggest a member of the minority who would serve upon the committee?

Mr. GRAHAM. That occurred, and the Chair said in response to that that there was a well-established precedent in the House; that there was a custom—

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman has again expired.

Mr. LLOYD. Mr. Speaker, I yield 10 minutes more to the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. GRAHAM. That there was a well-established custom in the House, much older than the chairman's service in the House, and he did not feel justified in breaking away from the precedent established.

Mr. BURKE of South Dakota. Mr. MONDELL, I believe, was present at that conference.

Mr. GRAHAM. I think so; I do not recall with certainty.

Mr. BURKE of South Dakota. Did not, as a matter of fact, the chairman make this statement: That while in the House a rule had been adopted to allow the minority to choose its membership upon committees; that the Chair did not recognize that rule in the committee, though the suggestor did not have that in mind, but he did have in mind that the majority most naturally would want a minority representation upon the committee?

Mr. GRAHAM. I do not recall the latter part of the gentleman's statement. I do recall that a remark was made to the effect that a majority of the House choose the membership of the House upon committees, but they did not consult the members of the committee as to where they would be placed upon the committee.

Mr. BURKE of South Dakota. And there was no suggestion by the gentleman who mentioned the matter that he intended anything more than to mention that if the minority were given an opportunity to confer, they would probably be able to get one Member to serve, and it was so stated to the chairman.

Mr. GRAHAM. And the Chair at that time said he was not then prepared to decide that question, and it never arose again.

Mr. BURKE of South Dakota. No; he appointed the ranking member and immediately left for Minneapolis.

Mr. GRAHAM. Not immediately.

Mr. BURKE of South Dakota. Very shortly.

Mr. GRAHAM. Oh, no; nearly a week later. Now, Mr. Speaker, as to the other matter mentioned by my colleague from Illinois. He speaks about Mrs. Grey as an employee of the committee and the House. She was never an employee of the committee. Mrs. Grey gave the committee information that was of material value to it, and the committee will receive such information from the gentleman from Illinois, my colleague, if he will bring information to it—

Mr. MANN. I will not take any pay for it—

Mr. GRAHAM. And the committee has been desirous and is desirous to know the facts whatever they are. Mrs. Grey has never to my knowledge received one dollar of public money and is in no way bound, as the gentleman from Illinois suggests that she is; she has never to my knowledge been in the employment of the Government.

What she has or has not been engaged in on the outside I have no knowledge, and I regard it as none of my business or of the committee's business. I repeat that the committee is desirous to know the truth wherever it comes from. They have no desire to know anything but the truth about these matters, and if anyone brings them information that proves to be true, the committee is willing to use it and let Congress and the country know what it is, whether it hurts the gentleman's feelings or not.

Mr. HUMPHREY of Washington. Will the gentleman yield for a question?

Mr. GRAHAM. Yes.

Mr. HUMPHREY of Washington. Is Mrs. Grey paid for furnishing this information?

Mr. GRAHAM. Mrs. Grey receives no public money whatever that I know of.

Mr. HUMPHREY of Washington. Do you know who does pay her?



Mr. GRAHAM. I have no knowledge of who pays her, and it is none of my business. She is interested in Indian matters, as are dozens of others here who come and bring us information, and if that information appears to be true we are bound to make use of it.

Mr. HUMPHREY of Washington. May I ask the gentleman another question? Do you know whether or not she is paid for furnishing this information to the committee?

Mr. GRAHAM. It is entirely immaterial whether I know it or not. The question is with reference to whether she is employed by the committee or by the House and receives public money. I repeat, that, so far as I know, she has never received a cent of public money, certainly not with my knowledge or assent.

Mr. HUMPHREY of Washington. Will the gentleman yield again? I will ask this question direct: Does not the gentleman know she is paid and know who is paying her?

Mr. GRAHAM. The gentleman repeats that he knows she has received no public money. And what other money she receives is no business of the gentleman from Washington or of mine.

Mr. HUMPHREY of Washington. Do you know that she has received public money?

Mr. GRAHAM. I have answered the question of the gentleman from Washington.

Mr. MANN. Mr. Speaker, I would like 10 minutes.

Mr. LLOYD. How much time have I remaining, Mr. Speaker?

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Missouri has 13 minutes remaining.

Mr. LLOYD. I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MANN].

Mr. MANN. Mr. Speaker, when the committee was appointed I suggested the names of the members of the minority on this Committee on Expenditures in the Interior Department, and suggested the names of Mr. MONDELL and Mr. HANNA, both of whom are experienced in land matters. I supposed that was what the committee was going to investigate. Subsequently, by reason of a resignation and a transfer of the gentleman from Missouri from this committee to another committee, made at my request, I suggested the name of the gentleman from South Dakota [Mr. BURKE], because he was experienced in matters relating to Indian affairs, and supposing, of course, that in all fairness, when the subcommittee was appointed in reference to expenditures relating to Indians, the minority member who was posted on the subject of Indians would be selected as a member of the subcommittee. When the gentleman named his committee and named the gentleman from Wyoming [Mr. MONDELL], that gentleman informed my colleague he could not serve on the committee and go to the Northwest. He came to me and conferred with me in regard to it, and wrote a letter to the chairman of the committee, my colleague from Illinois [Mr. GRAHAM], stating that he could not and would not go.

Mr. GRAHAM. He wrote no letter, except the one containing his resignation, of which I have spoken.

Mr. MANN. Now, the gentleman left town, and I think stopped in Illinois on the way.

Mr. GRAHAM. The gentleman is wrong.

Mr. MANN. But the gentleman now says he could not accept the resignation. The gentleman had the power of appointing the committee, and the chairman of a committee with power to appoint a committee has the power to substitute some one for a member who resigns, and always has had, and I repeat that it was absolutely unfair to the minority of the House, and, in my opinion, to the majority of the House, to decline to appoint on this committee which took this trip a minority Member who was willing to serve, whom we wanted to serve, and who knew something in reference to the subject matter.

Now, Mr. Speaker, the gentleman says that Mrs. Grey is not paid out of the public funds. I stated I understood that before. Who does pay her? Have we come to that status where an investigating committee has an employee paid by somebody interested in the investigation? Is somebody employing Mrs. Grey to act with this committee, who is afraid of being investigated? The gentleman admits that she is rendering the service. He wrote a letter to the Secretary of the Interior in November last, stating that Mrs. Grey desired access to the records in the Secretary's office. Mrs. Grey admits occupying a desk in the office of the Commissioner of Indian Affairs, because they have been informed that she was representing the Committee on Expenditures in the Department of the Interior.

Mrs. Grey visited the agency in Arizona last September, and desired to obtain information, and the agent in charge there wired to the Commissioner of Indian Affairs, asking whether he could furnish the information to Mrs. Grey, who claimed to

represent the Graham committee, and who claimed to be authorized to make investigations, and in accordance with the recommendation which had been made to the officers here the Commissioner of Indian Affairs wired to the agent in Arizona to extend to Mrs. Grey every official courtesy and to give her all the information in his office.

Who pays for that? The people who are being investigated? Is the committee permitting somebody to act as an employee of the committee who is being paid by the persons who are under investigation?

Suppose the Stanley investigating committee had attached to the personnel of that committee a paid employee of the United States Steel Corporation, with access to all of its papers? Mrs. Grey has done much more than that. In August last Mrs. Grey met an Indian by the name of Denominees and obtained from him a check for \$100 for services to be rendered in connection with Indian claims. In August last Mrs. Grey wrote a letter to an Indian which contained this:

I am at present employed by the committee of the House that is investigating the Indian Bureau, having on now an investigation of the Apaches of Arizona and also the White Earth, Minn. Both of these investigations were brought to the committee by me, and I am working with one of the attorneys of the Department of Justice who has charge of the prosecution of the White Earth Reservation in Minnesota.

And then she offers to have the restrictions on this Indian removed if he will pay her \$150, and also offers to represent the tribe of Indians at \$10 a day.

Mr. MARTIN of South Dakota. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MANN. In November last she sought the employment of another Indian, Henry Standing Bear, from whom she received money, and then stated that she was in the employ of the Committee on Expenditures in the Interior Department and could use her influence to obtain what the Indian wanted.

Why, when I was chairman of a committee of this House, if a clerk of mine had offered to represent a railroad company interested in legislation before my committee and it came to my knowledge, the employee would have been discharged at once and the papers referred to the Department of Justice. But when my colleague's attention was called to the fact that this lady had obtained \$100 to represent Indians, and afterwards that the person who had paid the money became dissatisfied with the prospects and demanded the check back, I am informed by an affidavit, which is on file, that my colleague told Mrs. Grey to keep the money.

That is a greater scandal, in my judgment, than this committee will ever turn up [applause on the Republican side] with \$7,500 or with \$75,000. These investigating committees have already cost the Government close to \$100,000, and no scandal has yet been exploited as great as having an employee of the committee soliciting employment for the benefit of the influence which that employee could exert on the committee. [Applause on the Republican side.]

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman has expired. The gentleman from Missouri [Mr. LLOYD] has three minutes.

Mr. LLOYD. Mr. Speaker, I ask for a vote.

The SPEAKER. Those in favor of the resolution will say "aye."

Mr. LLOYD. Mr. Speaker, there is a committee amendment.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the committee amendment.

Mr. MARTIN of South Dakota. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield to me for a question before a vote is taken?

The SPEAKER. Does the gentleman from Missouri yield for a question?

Mr. MARTIN of South Dakota. As I understand the statement of Mrs. Grey, and the statement of the chairman of this committee now asking for additional funds, they appear to agree that this lady is in the employ of the committee?

Mr. GRAHAM. I beg the gentleman's pardon. I specifically stated the contrary to that.

Mr. MARTIN of South Dakota. I understood the gentleman's statement, and it will appear in the Record, I hope, as he gave it. I would like to ask for information from the House before we appropriate further money for this purpose as to how this lady is paid for services to the committee.

The SPEAKER. Does the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. LLOYD] desire to reply to the gentleman from South Dakota?

Mr. LLOYD. I would rather not.

The Clerk read the committee amendment, as follows:

Strike out, in lines 8 and 9, the words "or any subcommittee of said committee."

The SPEAKER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment.

The question was taken, and the amendment was agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The question now is on agreeing to the amended resolution.

The question was taken, and the Speaker announced that the noes seemed to have it.

Mr. LLOYD. A division, Mr. Speaker.

The House divided; and there were—ayes 67, noes 41.

Accordingly the resolution was agreed to.

#### POST-OFFICE APPROPRIATION BILL.

Mr. MOON of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the further consideration of the Post Office appropriation bill; and pending that motion I ask unanimous consent that at 5.30 p. m. to-day the House take a recess until 7.30 p. m., the evening session to be devoted to general debate on the Post Office appropriation bill, and that the House adjourn at 11 o'clock.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. Moon] moves that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the further consideration of House bill 21279, the Post Office appropriation bill; and pending that he asks that at 5.30 p. m. the House take a recess until 7.30 p. m., and adjourn at 11 o'clock to-night, the night session to be solely for general debate on this bill.

Mr. MANN. With no other business to be transacted at the evening session?

The SPEAKER. No other business to be transacted, except general debate.

Mr. MANN. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, the gentleman from Tennessee expects that general debate will run through to-morrow, I take it?

Mr. MOON of Tennessee. Yes.

Mr. MANN. As I understand it, there is an understanding that the bill will not be read under the five-minute rule this week?

Mr. MOON of Tennessee. Not before Tuesday, I think.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

The motion of Mr. Moon of Tennessee was agreed to.

Accordingly the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the further consideration of the bill (H. R. 21279) making appropriations for the service of the Post Office Department for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1913, and for other purposes, with Mr. HAY in the chair.

Mr. WEEKS. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he desires to the gentleman from New York [Mr. CALDER].

Mr. CALDER. Mr. Chairman, it is with a feeling of extreme pleasure that I rise to speak in favor of several sections in the Post Office appropriation bill, which proposes changes in existing law. It is particularly gratifying to me, as I have always been a firm and consistent advocate of the reforms proposed, and it will afford me the greatest pleasure to cast my vote in favor of having them enacted into law.

The provision in the bill instructing the Postmaster General not to approve or allow to be used or pay for any railway post-office car not constructed of steel, steel underframe, or equally indestructible material, will, I feel certain, meet the approval of every Member of this House. The provision has, no doubt, been placed there by the committee for the ultimate protection of the railway mail clerks, whose lives are in constant danger in the discharge of their duties from defective postal-car construction. The duties of railway postal clerks not only require ability of a very high order, but the position is also a hazardous one. The tendency of the times is to throw all proper safeguard and protection around those engaged in hazardous employment, and the Government should set an example in protecting the lives and limbs of those engaged in the distribution of the mails on the railroads.

#### IN FAVOR OF AN EIGHT-HOUR LAW.

The section in the bill fixing an eight-hour day for letter carriers in the City Delivery Service and post-office clerks is one that meets with my most hearty approval. It has been the policy of the Government for the past 50 years to further an eight-hour day for all Government employees. Unfortunately and for some unknown reason the post-office clerks of this country have never enjoyed the benefits of an eight-hour law or, in fact, any law that places a limit on the hours of labor they can be employed in any one day. Why this discrimination has existed against these employees of our Government it is hard to understand, as their work is very exacting, and they deserve better treatment than they have received.

On May 24, 1888, Congress passed a law limiting the hours of labor for letter carriers in the City Delivery Service to eight hours each day. This law was enjoyed by these employees

until June 30, 1900. When the Post Office appropriation bill was under consideration on April 24, 1900, the chairman of the House Post Office Committee offered an amendment from the floor limiting the hours of labor of letter carriers to 48 hours during the six working days of each week. An objection was made to the amendment proposed, as it would nullify the letter carriers' eight-hour law, but the chairman of the committee arose and assured the House that his proposed amendment was introduced for the benefit of the letter carriers and met with their approval. Accepting the assurance of the chairman of the committee, the objection was withdrawn, and the 48-hour amendment was agreed to by unanimous consent. When the House convened the following day several Members arose and offered a vigorous protest against the manner in which the 48-hour amendment had been introduced on the previous day and stated that the letter carriers were opposed to a change in the eight-hour law, and the chairman of the committee assured the House that he would agree to a separate vote on his amendment. This promise, however, was not kept, and it has always been a sore spot in the minds of the letter carriers of this country when they think of the way in which their eight-hour law was taken away from them. The 48-hour law was only in force for one year, as it proved so unsatisfactory that the Post Office Department made no effort to have it replaced in any future appropriation bill. For nine years more the carriers continued to enjoy the benefits of the eight-hour law, until, on May 31, 1910, the Court of Claims, in a test case, decided that the act of June 2, 1900, known as the 48-hour law, superseded the eight-hour law of May 24, 1888, and a return was made to the 48-hour law on July 1, 1910. Judging from the complaints received from the letter carriers in all parts of the country, the 48-hour law is meeting with general disapproval. It appears from these complaints that there is no general rule or system under which the men are employed, and each postmaster is permitted to place his own construction on the law. There is no penalty attached to a violation of the 48-hour law on the part of administrative officers, nor can the carriers collect for any overtime when they are worked in excess of 48 hours.

The Supreme Court of the United States has held that where no provision for extra pay for overtime is contained in an act of Congress, and where there is no penalty attached to an officer of the Government for a violation of the law, that such an act is merely directory and can not be enforced. It can therefore be seen that the letter carriers, while presumably working under a 48-hour law, might just as well not be working under any law at all in so far as their being able to have the present 48-hour law enforced.

I am a firm believer in the eight-hour law and believe it should be strictly enforced in every branch of the Government service. I know, from observation and investigation, the work that the letter carriers and post-office clerks are required to do, and no body of men are more entitled to the protection of an eight-hour law than are these men.

#### THE RIGHT OF APPEAL TO CONGRESS.

Another section in the bill which meets with my hearty approval is section 6, which grants protection to the postal employees against oppression and gives them the right of free speech and the right to consult their Representatives in Congress. Mr. Speaker, I have been a Member of this House for eight years and during that time I have always tried to study every question that came before this House for consideration in order that I could cast my vote intelligently and for the best interests of the American people. During my first session of Congress I was desirous of learning the needs of the postal service and inquiring into the conditions of the employees. To my surprise I found that under an Executive order these civil-service employees could not give me any information and always referred me to the postmaster or the Post Office Department. I have always been at a loss to understand why such an order was ever issued, and the more I have studied the subject the more firmly I am convinced that it should be abrogated. There are always two sides to every question, and surely if any man is competent to express an opinion regarding the needs of the postal service it is the men who perform the actual work. If anyone is competent to make known unsatisfactory working conditions, who, might I ask, is better qualified to lay his proper grievances before Congress than the men who have complaints to make and who suffer from these grievances? The enactment of section 6 in the pending bill will grant to employees in the postal service the right to be furnished with a written copy of charges preferred against them and will allow the employees a reasonable time to answer said charges in writing and submit affidavits in support thereof. It also requires that a full and complete record of each case shall be filed in the proper depart-



ment and copies shall be annually reported to Congress, and if the employee desires a complete record of his case it shall be furnished him on request. It will also nullify the Executive orders which prohibit employees from presenting their grievances to Congress, except through the head of their respective departments. It will, in other words, give assurance and confidence to the employees that they will at least get a square deal and will not permit of supervisory or executive officers filing charges of one kind against an employee and having him removed from the service or reduced in salary on evidence submitted on matters entirely foreign to the original charges that the employee has answered in writing. Supervisory officials will hesitate to trump up charges against an employee for the purpose of satisfying some personal feeling, as all cases of removals and reductions will be submitted to Congress each year, and if an employee can produce satisfactory evidence that he has not received the protection afforded in this bill his case can be made the subject of special inquiry if Congress so decides.

It will also permit associations of employees in the postal service to present their proper grievances to Congress without danger of the members losing their positions or being reduced in grade or compensation. It will assure the employees that their proper appeals for a redress of grievances will receive the attention they deserve and will allow the representatives of the employees to appear before committees of Congress—such as the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads and the Committee on Reform in the Civil Service—to present their side of the case on pending matters affecting the interest of the employees. It will do away with the discontent and suspicion which now exists among the employees and will restore that confidence which is necessary to get the best results from the employees.

#### SUBSTITUTE LETTER CARRIERS.

Another matter that I desire to speak on to-day is one that should receive the attention of the House. I have repeatedly called the attention of the House to the unsatisfactory conditions surrounding the substitute letter carrier force of this country. I had hoped that the committee in its wisdom could have found some satisfactory solution to this perplexing problem and that something practical could be done for this branch of the service. Mr. Chairman, I submit herewith a statement showing the number of substitute clerks and carriers who have resigned from the postal service during the fiscal years ended June 30, 1909, 1910, and 1911:

Period.	Substitute—		Total.
	Clerks.	Carriers.	
July 1, 1908, to June 30, 1909.....	317	540	857
July 1, 1909, to June 30, 1910.....	417	698	1,115
July 1, 1910, to June 30, 1911.....	423	712	1,135
Total.....	1,157	1,950	3,107

I am not certain about the actual percentage of resignations, but am of the opinion that about 50 per cent of these who received appointments to the substitute service resign before they receive a regular appointment. I have endeavored in various ways to try and bring about a remedy in the hope that the substitute service could be made sufficiently attractive to induce the proper kind of men to accept these positions, as it is from the substitute force that the regular force of employees is recruited. I do not despair of my efforts, but will continue to draw the attention of Congress to the unsatisfactory condition surrounding the substitute letter carriers of the country until I succeed in bringing about a remedy.

To my mind the position should be abolished altogether, as it is a disgrace that men should be required to perform service under the present conditions. I believe that they should receive a regular salary, and that they should be required to work eight hours each day. They should be paid at least \$600 per annum during the time they serve as substitutes, as in this way they would be assured of a steady income and not be required to be living in a constant state of uncertainty as to what they will earn. I am further of the firm belief and conviction that it would be wise to abolish the \$600 grade altogether, so that when these men are appointed to regular positions after serving their period of substitution that their initial salary will be at least \$800 for the first year. If they serve as substitutes for a longer period than one year, I believe that the time they serve as such substitutes should count in their favor when they receive a regular appointment, and that their salary should be regulated accordingly and based on the salary law of March 2, 1907. I hope that the committee in its wisdom will take

this matter up after the Post Office appropriation bill is disposed of and that they will bring in a separate measure for the relief of the substitute letter carriers.

Mr. MOON of Tennessee. Mr. Chairman, I yield one hour to the gentleman from Connecticut [Mr. REILLY].

Mr. REILLY. Mr. Chairman, I desire to address myself to one or two of the legislative features of this bill.

The recommendation of the committee for an eight-hour work-day for letter carriers and post-office clerks is in conformity with the settled policy of Congress, as indicated by legislation covering a period dating from 1868. The enactment of an eight-hour law by Congress was unquestionably for the purpose of protecting the laboring man from the injurious consequences of prolonged physical effort, giving him more time for his personal affairs and more time and energy to devote to the cultivation of his moral and mental powers. This policy must be admitted by all to be a good one. The Federal Government has openly advocated this policy, and therefore the principle of the proposed legislation, I believe, should be considered and settled as approved in this bill.

The act of May 24, 1888, known as the letter-carriers' eight-hour law, limited the hours of labor of letter carriers to not more than eight hours each day. Notwithstanding the enactment of this law by Congress, no bona fide effort was made by the Post Office officials to put it into effect until after a decision of the Supreme Court of the United States in the case of the United States v. Post (148 U. S. R., 124), which was a claim of a letter carrier for payment for overtime. The result of the findings of the Supreme Court in this case was that more than \$3,000,000 was allowed by commissioners appointed by the Court of Claims to letter carriers in all parts of the country for overtime.

After the decision of the Supreme Court was announced Postmaster General Bissell issued an order under date of January 1, 1895, to prevent the further making of overtime, and after this order was issued no overtime was made by letter carriers. Thus it will be seen that for nearly seven years after the enactment of the letter-carriers' eight-hour law the men were required to work more than eight hours each day, but when the court decided that the carriers should be paid for the extra service an order from the department stopped this abuse, and the carriers for the first time actually enjoyed the benefit of a law that should have been in force for the seven years previous.

To carry out the instructions of the Postmaster General, it only required a readjustment of the routes and schedules by postmasters, and this was done without materially curtailing the service, and the rearrangement was made in such a way that it hardly attracted any public attention. It was a matter for the postmasters and supervisory employees to arrange districts and schedules so as to utilize the time of the employees to the best possible advantage, and each postmaster was held accountable for bringing about the required change.

The letter carriers continued to enjoy the benefits of the eight-hour law until June 30, 1900. When the Post Office appropriation bill making appropriations for the Post Office Department for the fiscal year ended June 30, 1901, was under consideration, Mr. Loud, the chairman of the committee, offered an amendment from the floor on April 24, 1900, which reads as follows:

*Provided, That letter carriers may be required to work as nearly as practicable only eight hours on each working day, but not in any event exceeding 48 hours during the six working days of each week, and such number of hours on Sunday, not exceeding eight, as may be required by the needs of the service; and if a legal holiday shall occur on any working day, the service performed on said day, if less than eight hours, shall be counted as eight hours without regard to the time actually employed.*

This 48-hour law did not give satisfaction either to the letter carriers or to the officials who honestly tried to enforce it. In fact, it met with such general disapproval that on April 6, 1901, the First Assistant Postmaster General called upon the Assistant Attorney General for the Post Office Department for an opinion construing the proviso in the Post Office appropriation bill. The opinion rendered was that the proviso was temporary in its operation and would end June 30, 1901, and it was left to die a natural death for the reason that the officials who had previously favored it found that it was without merit and could not be operated successfully. During the first year that it was in force and effect there were as many different constructions placed on the law as there were minds to construe it, and the result was that the carriers never knew what their hours of duty were actually going to be.

Beginning July 1, 1901, a return was made to the eight-hour law of May 24, 1888.

Under date of April 8, 1909, the Postmaster General submitted a letter to the Court of Claims, asking for an opinion as to whether the act of May 24, 1888, known as the 8-hour law, or

the act of June 2, 1900, known as the 48-hour law, was in force, stating in his communication that there were controverted questions of law involved and asking the court for an opinion. On May 13, 1909, the Postmaster General transmitted to the Court of Claims, for adjudication, the question of the right of a letter carrier in the Washington (D. C.) post office to receive additional compensation for overtime.

The case in issue was that, while the carrier did not work more than 48 hours during the 6 working days of the week, there were separate days in which he worked more than 8 hours. A decision in this case was handed down by the court on May 31, 1910, in which the court decided that the act of June 2, 1900, known as the 48-hour law, was still in force, and decided the case against the carrier. The case in issue was a test case made up by the Post Office Department officials, and there was no contention on the part of the carriers of the country that the 8-hour law was being violated, nor were there any claims pending for any overtime.

The experience of the past two years, judging from the complaints of the carriers, has been anything but satisfactory, and are similar to those experienced during the first year that the law was tried as an experiment. There is no penalty attached to the present 48-hour law that will compel its enforcement either by way of payment for overtime or by compelling a strict enforcement of the law by those intrusted to carry it out.

The enactment into law of the legislation recommended in this bill will give to the letter carriers and post-office clerks the benefits of an eight-hour workday, such as is now enjoyed by other Government employees, and is the well-settled policy of Congress on this important question.

To my mind eight hours are as many as a man of average strength and health can keep up the exertion of his physical and mental forces, doing justice to his work, and retain his powers during the full office working period of a lifetime. The best interests of the postal service will be conserved by placing the clerks and carriers on an eight-hour basis, as the men will then know just how many hours of service they will be required to work and can give a better and more satisfactory service when they know that they will not be required or permitted to work an unlimited amount of time on some days, while not required to do an ordinary day's work on other days.

It is the contention of the Postmaster General that "the mails do not flow evenly or uniform in quantity on each day of the week." That the mail varies in volume is unquestionably true, and is it not a fact that the ordinary commercial business varies in activity from day to day and are not men expected and required to put forth extra effort on busy days while they can relax from their efforts on days when the volume of business is not so great?

It seems to be the contention of the department that the men should be required to work continuously up to the highest pitch of their ability and should not be allowed any breathing spell. A good draft horse would not be treated by its owner in such a manner, for no animal could stand up under a continual grind if taxed to its utmost at all times. Under the present 48-hour law the men are worked as hard as they can peg and are driven to extremes on what the officials are pleased to call a heavy day, and if the next day's mail is not sufficient to load the carrier down and he has made overtime on the previous day why a trip is omitted and he is allowed to lay off a trip, but must take out all the accumulated mail on the following trip. The time he is off duty is of no use to him, as he must report on schedule time, and it is then he receives notice that a trip is omitted and he can lie around either in a room in the basement of the post office, or if there is no waiting room then he must go out in the street and wait until reporting time for his next trip.

In the meantime the business men who received orders in the mail on that light day are penalized and their mail is not delivered to them because of a desire to economize by saving a few cents on the time of the poor letter carrier. The contention is made by the officials that if we put the postal service on an eight-hour basis it will require the appointment of additional men.

Well, supposing it does require the appointment of additional men? The same contention has been made whenever any bill has come before Congress limiting the hours of labor to eight, and it has been prophesied that dire calamity would follow the enactment of such legislation, and when the bills became laws it only required the adjustment of affairs to meet the new conditions required, and this will be the result if this bill passes.

If an emergency arises which will require the employment of clerks and carriers for a longer period than eight hours in order to deliver the mail, provision is made in this bill for

just such emergencies, and all that is necessary is to pay these employees for the extra service.

The department, in its desire to discredit the employees and in its opposition to an eight-hour law, makes use of the statement that—

there are many who would find in this opportunity to obtain additional compensation for overtime such inducement for loitering and wasting time that the additional cost of the service would be very much.

Mr. Chairman, I consider this a gratuitous insult to these men to say that they would take advantage of this provision to obtain additional compensation. The letter carriers and post-office clerks would prefer to have a strict eight-hour law that would limit the hours of duty to not more than eight hours under any conditions; but realizing that this would possibly curtail the service in emergency periods, they waived their personal desires in order to provide for the prompt delivery of the mail under every possible condition.

There are postmasters, assistant postmasters, and supervisory employees in all post offices to see that the mail is gotten out on time and that each employee is doing his full duty, and it is a sad commentary on their ability and knowledge of the service if they could not detect loitering or expansion of time on the part of the employees. They are required to do this now under present conditions, and surely the enactment of an eight-hour law would in no way limit the proper supervision of the service.

It is said that "in so far as practicable" letter carriers are now required to work no more than eight hours a day; and under a decision of the Court of Claims, rendered May 31, 1910, they can not be required to work more than 48 hours during the six working days of the week. Well, if this is so, there will need to be but little rearrangement of the service to put an eight-hour law into effect at once. The contention is made by the employees that their hours of service are not only uncertain, but that every principle of the 8-hour law is being violated and that there are as many different constructions placed on the 48-hour law as there are minds in the supervisory force.

Under the eight-hour law, passed May 24, 1888, which the letter carriers only enjoyed for a few years, there was little complaint from anyone, but those who are opposed to the eight-hour day on principle and those men holding official positions who strove to break down the eight-hour law by trying to get the carriers to evade it by working overtime and not recording it. In order to make the eight-hour law as obnoxious as possible the department issued an order that under no circumstances were carriers to be permitted to work overtime, and when their eight hours was up they should return to the post office with the undelivered mail, which was held until the following day for delivery. Notwithstanding this handicap, the carriers performed their work in such a way that very little complaint came from the public, for the reason that when the men found that they had more mail than they could ordinarily handle they made extra efforts to get rid of all their first-class mail within schedule time.

#### VACATION AND SUBSTITUTES.

Another system which has been put into effect recently, and which has worked a severe hardship on the carriers, is the doubling up on their districts during the vacation period in order to save the expense of employing substitutes. As a rule the postmaster arranges to give the carriers their vacation during the summer months when it is claimed that the mail is light, and the men are compelled to serve their own district and part of the district of another carrier who is off duty on his vacation. The result is that the men are loaded down in the heated summer season, as they are in winter, with the additional labor of carrying not only their own district but additional territory with which they are unfamiliar. Complaints have been made that the men have been so taxed that they break down under the strain of the extra work placed on them during the summer vacation period and die in the harness.

#### FALSE ECONOMY.

Congress has appropriated money for the employment of substitutes for regular letter carriers during the vacation period, but the department instead of expending this money for the purpose for which it was appropriated has issued orders to postmasters to curtail the service and add additional territory to the men in order to economize in expenditures. Much has been said about the great economies practiced by the administration, and a publicity bureau seems to have been established to herald to the country the economies in the postal service. I am in favor of economy, as I believe that every Member of this House is also in favor of economizing along



proper lines the curtailing of expenditures of public moneys, and particularly in stamping out extravagant expenditures. One serious objection to the present policy of the Post Office Department is that economies are being practiced at the expense of a curtailment of the service to such an extent that the business people have entered serious and emphatic protests against the irregular delivery of the mails; and the economies practiced at the expense of the employees by adding every possible ounce that they can stand to their burdens I feel confident does not meet with public approval. It is always the case that when savings are to be made and expenditures curtailed that the first to feel the effect of it are the hardest worked and poorest paid employees, and this seems to be particularly so in the present management of the postal service, judging from the complaints received from the rural letter carriers, the railway mail clerks, the city letter carriers, and post-office clerks.

The Postmaster General, in his letter opposing the eight-hour law, states that—

It is the policy of the department to arrange the work of clerks and carriers so that their eight hours' daily service will cover the shortest possible period of time, and the hours of duty of the great majority should not extend over 10 hours, but it is not to the interest of the service to limit this employment to any given period of 10 hours, owing to the varying schedule of arrival and departure of mails at the different offices.

If it is so, as admitted, that the vast majority of these employees have their schedules limited to 10 hours or less, then it is all the more reason why a limit of time should be set in order to give all the employees the benefit of a limited 10-hour schedule. There should be some regard shown for the employees in arranging their tours of duty, and if a limit is placed by law that must be followed there is not a question of doubt in my mind but the postmasters will arrange the tours in such a way as to keep the men employed to the best possible advantage. A postmaster should be a man of executive ability, and if he possesses any of it at all he will see to it that his supervisory force arranges the work and schedules to get the best results. It shows to my mind that the employees are very liberal in their views when they are willing to have their 8 hours of service cover a period of 10 hours, and I believe it would show the proper spirit if the department officials would view things with a proper regard for the comfort and working conditions of the men.

#### SUNDAY WORK.

Until one year ago post-office clerks and letter carriers of this country were required to perform service on Sundays, for which they were not allowed either extra compensation or time off on one of the other six working days. Every possible effort was made to reduce Sunday service, and there being no law covering the subject each postmaster made such rules and regulations as he thought fit regarding the employment of these men on Sunday. The department stated many times that they were in favor of reducing Sunday service to the lowest possible minimum necessary to meet the proper requirements of the service, but as this was simply an expression of opinion or policy it was only followed in offices where the postmasters were really desirous and anxious to reduce Sunday service.

In the Post Office appropriation bill for the current fiscal year provision was made to grant compensatory time on the working days to employees who are required to work on Sunday. The result has been that the great majority of the employees now enjoy one day of rest each week, but in order that all the employees should be granted this privilege the committee has recommended a provision which if enacted into law will give all the men the benefit of one day of rest in seven.

The Postmaster General, in closing his letter, states that—

It is thought that the plan of giving the department authority to allow not exceeding 30 days' leave of absence with pay to clerks and carriers would prove not only less expensive than the legislation proposed, but more advantageous to the employees affected.

Mr. Speaker, if the expressions of opinion received by me in letters and personal interviews I have had with the employees since becoming a Member of this House express the sentiment of the men throughout the country, and I believe they do, then the Postmaster General has no idea of what the true sentiment of the employees really is. While it is true that these men would no doubt enjoy 30 days' leave of absence each year if a law was passed granting them this privilege, yet I am firmly convinced that they would much prefer the legislation recommended in this bill, that will insure their promotion to the highest grades when they have earned such promotion by length of service and efficiency and limiting their hours of labor to eight hours each day and giving them a day of rest each week. Surely this is not asking too much, and I believe if every Member of this House had the same opportunity to investigate the working

conditions of the clerks and carriers of the post offices in this country they would join with the members of the Post Office and Post Roads Committee in placing the legislation recommended on the statute books.

#### GAG RULE.

The committee has recommended, with a few modifications, a bill introduced by Mr. LLOYD, of Missouri, which, to my mind, will correct an abuse that has been allowed to exist for too long a time. For the information of the Members of the House I will insert in the RECORD a copy of an Executive order covering the civil-service employees:

It is hereby ordered that no bureau, office, or division chief, or subordinate in any department of the Government, and no officer of the Army or Navy or Marine Corps stationed in Washington, shall apply to either House of Congress or to any committee of either House of Congress, or to any Member of Congress for legislation, or for appropriations, or for congressional action of any kind, except with the consent and knowledge of the head of the department; nor shall any such person respond to any request for information from either House of Congress, or any committee of either House of Congress, or any Member of Congress, except through or as authorized by the head of his department. (Executive order, Nov. 26, 1909.)

This rule, which is known by the employees as the "gag rule," has, as its name implies, effectually choked these employees and tied them hand and foot, and has prevented them from uttering any word of complaint even against the most outrageous treatment that could be heaped upon them. It has denied these employees the right of petition to Congress of their grievances unless their petition is presented through the head of the department under which they serve.

And by the way, that the Executive has experienced a change of heart, that he has realized that this is not a fair rule, is shown by the annulment of that rule to a certain extent within the past 48 hours.

It is a fact well known to many Members of this House that employees of the Government, through their associations in convention assembled, have discussed conditions of employment, hours of labor, and matters affecting the working and sanitary conditions surrounding their employment, and have passed resolutions which have been submitted year after year to Cabinet officers under whom they serve, but their grievances or petitions or resolutions were never submitted to Congress by these officials. Considering this condition of affairs, I believe it is high time that Congress should listen to the appeals of these men and provide a way whereby they can properly present a petition to the Members of Congress for a redress of grievances without the fear of losing their official positions.

The legislation recommended in this bill will insure to all the civil-service employees in the postal service the right to be furnished with a written copy of charges preferred against them, and will allow the employees a reasonable time to answer said charges in writing and to submit affidavits in support of their defense. It also requires that a full and complete record of each case shall be filed in the proper department or office, and copies shall be annually reported to Congress, and if the employee desires a complete record of his case it should be furnished him on request. The bill also provides that a copy be furnished to the Civil Service Commission on request of that body. This will give assurance and confidence to the employees that they will at least get a square deal, and will not permit of officers filing charges of one kind against an employee and having him removed from the service or reduced in salary on evidence submitted by the officer on matters entirely foreign to the original charges that the employee has answered in writing.

Men in official positions will hesitate to trump up charges against an employee for the purpose of satisfying some personal animus or a political grudge, as all the cases of removals and reductions will be submitted to Congress each year, and the Members of this body can get a copy of all the papers in any case, and will be relieved of the necessity of losing much valuable time in calling at the department in person on matters affecting the interest of one of the employees in whom they are interested. It will also nullify the provisions of the Executive order which I referred to in the beginning of my remarks on this subject, and will permit associations of employees in the postal service to present their grievances to the Congress or any Member thereof without danger of the employees losing their positions or being reduced in grade or compensation.

I know that some Members of this House will say that this might possibly open a way to indiscreet men to present their personal or imaginary grievances to Members of Congress, but if this is so such employees would have to assume the responsibility for their acts in the event of making false or misleading charges that could not be borne out by evidence on investigation. Above all, it would insure the right of petition to those employees whose rights have been taken away from them by this

Executive order, and I believe it is the duty of Congress, when flagrant injustice is brought to its attention, to provide a remedy at once.

This legislation will assure the employees that their proper appeals for a redress of grievances will receive the attention they deserve and will allow the representatives of the employees to appear before the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads or other committees of this House to present their side of the case on pending matters affecting the interest of the employees.

Under the present order of things the committee only gets one side of a case unless the members of the committee assume to themselves the responsibility of making a personal investigation or personal inquiry among the employees of their acquaintance. I believe it is well to have as much publicity as possible on public matters, and further believe that it is absolutely wrong and manifestly unfair and unjust to place the welfare of thousands of our citizens in the hands and at the mercy of the whims of any single individual, whether he be a Cabinet officer or anyone else. The employees in the postal service are, as a rule, men of high ideals and of good standing in their respective communities, and any law or rule that has for its object the curtailment of their rights will meet with just resentment. Let us lift this ban from around the necks of these men and take the gag from out their mouths and give them the assurance that the fact of their accepting a position in the Government service will not disbar them from presenting their proper petitions to Congress.

Mr. O'SHAUNESSY. What modification has been made of the gag rule by the recent order of the President?

Mr. REILLY. Practically none. It simply provides that an employee may petition Congress, but it must be done through the head of the department. He can have no direct communication with Congress or with any Member thereof.

Mr. O'SHAUNESSY. And heretofore—

Mr. REILLY. Even that was prevented.

Mr. O'SHAUNESSY. Heretofore no petition made to the head of a department had ever been presented to Congress.

Mr. REILLY. Not so far as anyone knows; and it can be readily seen what standing an employee of the department would have thereafter if he complained of the conduct of a certain official or of the head of his department through the head of that department.

Mr. O'SHAUNESSY. The gentleman speaks of carriers getting vacations and having to work the route of another man. Has not that resulted in a poor service to the public?

Mr. REILLY. I do not think there is any question about the service deteriorating under that plan, because of putting double work upon a man in the heat of summer, when it is harder to perform.

Mr. O'SHAUNESSY. And making him serve a route with which he is not familiar.

Mr. REILLY. With which he is entirely unfamiliar, or almost wholly so.

Mr. O'SHAUNESSY. Did the gentleman, as a member of the committee or as a Member of the House, receive complaints as to a spy system among the clerks also?

Mr. REILLY. I received one or two complaints of that sort, but they were not nearly so plain or so positive as those in regard to the carriers.

Mr. O'SHAUNESSY. Is it not a fact that in the post offices of the country men who are employed by the Government as clerks are given collateral employment without compensation by postmasters and other supervising officials to spy upon their fellows in the service?

Mr. REILLY. I have heard such a story, but I would not pretend to say that it was true.

#### UNFAIR TREATMENT.

For several years past the President has issued an order each year declaring for a Saturday half holiday during the summer months. This order affects all Government employees in the departments and in the Government Printing Office and the Bureau of Engraving and Printing, but, strange to say, it does not include the letter carriers and clerks in post offices.

In nearly all cities the postmasters and local officials take advantage of this order and take a well-earned rest after their weeks' work, and are better fitted to resume their duties on Monday morning. I stated a moment ago that the post-office clerks and letter carriers do not get the benefit of this Saturday half holiday. Yes; I repeat that they do not get the benefit of the order, and I further declare that during the heated term, at a season of the year when the President feels that the best interest of the service is conserved by granting the employees a

half holiday, these clerks and carriers are required to do more work than is expected of them at other periods.

#### SPYING SYSTEM.

I have been asked if I could not do something to stamp out the spy system. It seems that in some post offices there are men designated as "gum-shoe men," who go out and follow the carriers around on their districts and spy on them from doorways and behind tree boxes and wagons and other obstacles and note from a distance every little act of the carrier, whether he walks slowly or stops to answer a question of a citizen or to answer questions of householders, and the report of these spies is used as the basis of charges preferred against these men.

Sometimes the "gum-shoe man" is sent out with the carrier in order to test the district and find out if the carrier is doing his full duty in the shortest space of time. These men, unhampered and with nothing heavier in their possession than a watch which they generally hold in their hands, set a pace for the carrier and start to hotfoot it over the district. If the carrier can not keep up with the pace set for him, he is reported as delinquent and not doing all the work that the "spotter" thinks he should do. I do not believe that the people of this country are in favor of any such system as this, and if these conditions are true, I believe that it is well for Congress to be familiar with them, and there is no way that we can get this information unless we pass a law that will permit the employees to submit to their Member of Congress a statement of the conditions under which they work when these conditions become obnoxious.

#### COUNTING CARRIERS' STEPS.

Some communications received by me contain information that is news to me. One letter contained a copy of an order issued by the superintendent of the Brooklyn post office, which reads as follows:

On Tuesday, February 20, 1912, each carrier of the general post office will make an accurate account of the exact number of steps taken by him during the day while engaged in serving route or collecting. When submitting count at the end of each tour, each carrier will note on his slip the exact length in inches from heel to heel of an ordinary step taken by him.

In this same letter came a newspaper clipping from the Brooklyn Standard Union, which stated that 65 pounds of mail was the average amount taken out by letter carriers, and that this information had been gathered by the Committee on Expenditures in the Post Office Department, on a recent visit to that city. It was learned by the committee that the order I have read was actually issued by the superintendent and that it was expected that the carriers would obey it and furnish the information requested. I would like the Members of this House to try and draw on their imagination long enough to picture a letter carrier with 65 pounds of mail on his back, composed of letters, packages, newspapers, and magazines, trying to keep his mind on his work and at the same time count and measure every step he took from the time he left the post office until he returned. I have been informed that there are more than 1,000 letter carriers in the Brooklyn post office, and that when this order was issued that some of the men, in going over their routes and trying to obey it, were accused by the public of being intoxicated, and many of the public who had learned to respect their letter carrier, were so horrified at the conduct of the men that they actually believed that they were losing their minds, and this gag law would not permit of the presentation of these facts to the Members of this House by these employees. I would much prefer if some member of the Committee on Expenditures in the Post Office Department would explain to the House the conditions that they found in that office on their recent visit. [Applause.]

I want to say to you gentlemen that the condition I have described as applied to the letter carriers applies equally if not with greater force to the post-office clerks. I believe the charge that is being made by the department in opposition to this legislative feature of the bill, namely, this eight-hour provision, that it will be the cause of men delaying their route and thereby getting overtime, is not worthy of consideration. I believe that it is an insult to the honesty and integrity of these men, who are among the most faithful employees of this Government, and I believe further that any executive order issued by an understrapper, or by the Postmaster General himself, who will state that as a reason for opposing this eight-hour bill men will be induced to loaf to get overtime, is not worthy of that position and is not worthy of the confidence of the Members of this House in anything he says. [Applause.]

These features of this bill, I believe, are humane in every respect. I believe that this eight-hour bill can be enforced without the expenditure of one additional dollar, because during



the seven years when the department was made to have the eight-hour law lived up to it was done. These routes can be arranged, these terms of service of the post-office clerks can be so arranged, that the work can be done within the eight hours; and if overtime is necessary, I believe it is entirely a fair proposition that the clerks and carriers should be paid pro rata.

In England when overtime is performed the clerk or carrier is paid one and one-quarter or one and one-half time. In regard to the Sunday service, a man has been allowed compensatory time of 10 minutes to-day and 10 minutes to-morrow scattered through the week, and it does him no good whatever. This bill provides that when a man performs one or two hours' duty on Sunday he shall have the same length of time given in the following week day.

#### AS TO CLERKS.

Clerks in post offices of the first and second class have never been protected in any way by any legislation to limit their hours of labor. As a consequence, they have been compelled to work any number of hours that the whim or caprice of their superiors might see fit to exact.

In view of the accepted policy of this Government that not more than eight hours of labor in each day shall be demanded of its employees, it is impossible to justify the discrimination that excepts this worthy class of employees from the operation of this beneficent policy.

On June 30, 1911, there were 32,319 clerks employed in the 2,351 first and second class post offices of the United States.

The hours of labor and the working conditions of such a vast army of public employees can only be properly and safely regulated by statutory legislation.

It stands to reason that where the power of interpretation as to what constitutes a day's labor for these employees is vested in 2,351 individual postmasters, discrimination, favoritism, and chaos is bound to prevail. These postmasters, it must be borne in mind, constitute a shifting force, constantly coming and going. The condition as to their hours of labor has been so burdensome that for years these clerks have been appealing to Congress to enact legislation for their relief. Such legislation is their greatest need.

In 230 first and second class post offices, located in practically every State of the Union, the clerks report that for the month of October, 1911, they were actually on duty for a daily average of from 8 hours and 30 minutes to 12 hours. Because these clerks work behind the four walls of a post office, not much is known of the nature of their duties. Their work is exacting, both body and mind being constantly employed. A very large percentage is employed at night, working under artificial light and very often in poorly ventilated and crowded quarters. Besides the time the clerk is actually on duty at the post office, a large percentage of them are required to devote hours of study on their own time to master the difficult "schemes" of mail distribution, that they may rapidly and correctly distribute and dispatch the mail for every State in the Union. For these extra hours of study they receive no consideration whatever.

This proposed legislation provides that these clerks, as well as the letter carriers, shall be compelled to work not more than 8 hours a day, provided that the 8 hours shall be worked within a period of 10 consecutive hours.

There is an excellent reason for the proviso. Under existing conditions in the service, even where an eight-hour schedule may be in force, the eight hours is often spread out over a day of 12 hours and even more. This means that the clerk is compelled to report for duty three or more times a day. He is compelled to register off duty from two to four hours at a time. This time off duty is so broken up that it can not be put to any practical use by the clerk. He either remains within the post-office building or if his home is in the immediate vicinity he may go there for an hour or so.

The necessity for being within call of the office imposes a direct financial loss, because the employee is prohibited by the circumstances of his employment from living at a distance from the office where the rents are cheaper or where he might even hope to acquire a home. This system of compelling the employees to register off duty at different times of the day is peculiar to the postal service and it may safely be said that no such system would be tolerated by a private employer.

In opposition to the enactment of this legislation it is contended that because of a supposed variation in the volume of the mails at different seasons of the year, it is impracticable to work the clerks on a daily schedule of eight hours, the eight hours to be worked within a period of 10 consecutive hours. That to establish an eight-hour day would mean that more clerks than are necessary would have to be employed during certain periods in order to have on hand a sufficient force to work the mails when the volume might be greater. That the

provision of this proposed legislation which provides that the employees affected shall be paid extra for all time worked in excess of eight hours would be a temptation to the employees to purposely extend their labors beyond the eight-hour period to increase their compensation. That the proposed legislation might prove costly and wasteful.

#### VOLUME OF MAIL.

In the first place, there is not such a great change in the volume of mail matter as might be supposed. Following is a table showing the total postal receipts by months for the fiscal year ended June 30, 1911, for the 50 largest post offices in the country:

July	\$7,453,818.00
August	8,492,885.26
September	9,900,181.93
October	9,696,970.57
November	9,956,475.20
December	11,528,332.63
January	9,620,564.06
February	9,339,037.50
March	11,175,486.00
April	9,714,929.68
May	9,238,842.86
June	9,315,525.29
Total	115,433,649.58

The receipts from these 50 largest offices represent 48.52 per cent of the total receipts of the entire postal service.

There is, of course, a very close relationship between the postal revenues and the volume of mail matter.

A study of the postal revenues by months indicates that there is comparatively little change in the amount of monthly receipts for eight months of the year, namely, September, October, November, January, February, April, May, and June, the average for these eight months being \$9,597,815.88. The receipts for November were \$9,956,475.20. This indicates remarkable uniformity in the volume of mail for eight months of the year.

The receipts for August are approximately \$1,000,000 less than this average for the eight months quoted, and the receipts for July are approximately \$2,000,000 less.

These are the two abnormally light months of the year in midsummer and it is at this time that the clerks take their annual vacations of 15 days. The department has contended that during these summer months the clerks do not work as much as 8 hours a day and consequently are compensated for the days in winter when they are obliged to work 9 and 10 hours.

As a matter of fact the clerks never average less than eight hours a day because of the large number who take their vacations in the summer months, the clerks remaining on duty being compelled to take care of the work of the clerks who are on leave.

For the next fiscal year the department asked for \$175,000 to compensate substitutes who might act for clerks on vacation leave, this sum being \$50,000 more than the amount appropriated for the current year.

On page 76 of the hearings on the Post Office appropriation bill we find the following statement by the First Assistant Postmaster General bearing on the subject:

MR. GRANDFIELD. Yes, sir. The law now provides for 15 days' leave of absence with pay, exclusive of Sundays and holidays, to clerks in post offices after one year's service. The appropriation heretofore made has enabled the department to allow substitutes for only about 10 per cent of the clerks. There has been no increase in the appropriation for several years and we have more or less trouble in providing a sufficient force of substitutes to take the place of clerks on leave, and for that reason we have asked for a considerable increase.

MR. FINLEY. The clerks who remain on duty complain in some instances that they have been required to do overwork.

MR. GRANDFIELD. Yes, sir; that has some bearing on it, too, but heretofore we have appointed most of the additional clerks on the 1st of July and utilized the services of the additional men during July and August in taking the places of the regular employees absent on leave. Last year, I think, we appointed more on October 1 than on July 1, because on October 1 the business in the post offices, as a rule, begins to increase materially.

This statement that the department does not furnish substitute or auxiliary help for more than 10 per cent of the clerks on vacation makes it self-evident that the extra work thrown upon the clerks remaining on duty renders less than an eight-hour schedule in the summer impossible.

Reliable statistics gathered from the clerks themselves indicate very plainly that the clerks, and particularly those employed in the smaller first-class offices and those employed in second-class offices, are very frequently compelled to work from one-half to three hours in excess of eight hours per day in order that the work may be kept up during the vacation period. This condition of affairs robs the clerks of all opportunity for summer relaxation. The postal receipts for December and March are approximately \$2,000,000 above the average of the normal eight months of the year.

The receipts for these two months indicate an abnormal volume of mail. One of several ways to meet the emergencies of these two months, or any other period of emergency that may possibly arise, is provided for in this proposed legislation in the following quoted paragraph:

That in cases of emergency, or if the needs of the service require, letter carriers in the City Delivery Service and clerks in first and second class post offices can be required to work in excess of eight hours a day, and for such additional services they shall be paid extra in proportion to their salaries as fixed by law.

In connection with this paragraph it is essential to bear in mind that no legislation to limit the hours of labor can be legal and valid unless some penalty clause is included which will provide that extra pay must be paid for all services in excess of the eight hours.

The Supreme Court has held that the general eight-hour law of 1868, which applies to Government laborers, mechanics, etc., is merely directory and not mandatory, because it did not provide for any penalty in the event that the employee worked in excess of eight hours. Even this act does not cover clerks.

It hardly seems worth while to argue further against the absurd and groundless contention that under the operation of the law in this paragraph that the employees would purposely extend their tours of duty beyond eight hours for the sake of increasing their compensation. The men in the service want an eight-hour day. They are as loyal to the service as their superiors, and would scorn to take any such advantage of the law even if they were permitted to do so.

The department has at its command now an excellent remedy to apply to all emergencies of the service. The salary-classification act of March 2, 1907, providing for the classification and promotion of letter carriers and clerks employed in first and second class offices contains the following section:

That after June 30, 1907, auxiliary employees may be employed to be paid for actual service at the rate of 30 cents an hour: *Provided*, That such employees shall be required to work not less than two hours daily, and may serve as substitutes: *And provided further*, That such employees shall be eligible for appointment as clerks and carriers of the first grade.

This section was drawn by the department and, with the intention of providing a means with which to meet all periods of emergency by the employment of temporary help at the rate of 30 cents an hour.

Thus we see that the department itself has provided a way to prevent any overmanning of the service at any period of the year.

Suppose it should be necessary to employ the experienced clerks in excess of eight hours at such times as during the holiday period. The means is here provided. No attempt is here made to compel the Government to pay for this extra service at the rate of time and a half or time and a quarter. It is simply provided that the employee be paid exactly the same for time worked in excess of eight hours as he is paid for time within the eight hours.

If the theory of extra pay for time worked in excess of eight hours a day needs justification in the eyes of anyone it is to be found in the intention of the existing salary law of March 2, 1907, which contemplated meeting emergency periods by the employment of auxiliary help at the rate of 30 cents an hour. The average annual salary of the letter carrier is now \$1,084, and the average annual salary of the post-office clerk is \$1,082. On the basis of an eight-hour day the hourly compensation of these employees amounts to 36 cents.

Surely, then, if the services of a comparatively inexperienced "auxiliary" or "substitute" employee is conceded to be worth 30 cents an hour the service will surely be the gainer if during the holiday rush regular and experienced employees are at the command of the department at the average rate of 36 cents an hour.

If precedent were needed to justify the theory of extra pay for extra duty, it can be found in the English postal service. In the English service it is provided that time and a quarter be paid for all extra duty on week days. In the English service it is provided that all work on Sundays, Christmas Day, and on Good Friday be compensated for at the rate of time and one-half. For the purpose of recording all such extra duty the English service furnishes a stock form known as "extra-duty claim form." In the English system eight hours is a day's work and seven hours is a night's work.

That the department is not really opposed to extra pay for extra service in periods of emergency is indicated in the following statement of the First Assistant Postmaster General, which appears on page 113 of the hearings on the Post Office appropriation bill for 1913:

Mr. GRANDFIELD. Yes, sir. I have examined only a few reports and I do not know to what extent the men were required to work overtime. However, I think it is a wise provision of law to permit this overtime at that particular season of the year.

This statement was made with reference to a clause concerning overtime for letter carriers which was incorporated in the current appropriation bill and which reads as follows:

That no part of this appropriation shall be used to pay letter carriers who are required or permitted to work for more than 48 hours in the six working days of a week: *Provided further*, That this limitation shall not apply to service performed during the first 5 and the last 15 days of the calendar year.

It must also be borne in mind that whenever a clerk is absent for any cause for a fraction of a day his pay is reduced on the basis of his hourly earnings.

However, there is really little to fear in regard to extra time for the employees. If the Congress establishes an eight-hour bill for post-office clerks, the department at Washington will have thrust upon it an incentive which does not now exist, to see that its army of supervisory officers throughout the country will so arrange the schedules of the employees that the 8 hours of work may be completed within a period of 10 hours. Experience has demonstrated that without such an incentive the department does not insist upon an intelligent arrangement of schedules.

#### HANDLING THE MAIL.

Another matter of importance in considering the practicability of an 8-hour day is the difference in the classes of mail matter. First-class matter, which is the great revenue-producing class of mail, does not by any means constitute the maximum proportion of all mail matter. Under existing conditions an effort is usually made to give the same service to the mail matter of second, third, and fourth class that is now given to first class. With the possible exception of daily and weekly papers and market reports, there seems to be no good reason why the same service should be given to the classes of mail matter which do not produce the same revenue. With the existence of an 8-hour schedule the force could be constantly employed for a period of 8 hours within 10 hours by giving first attention to first-class matter and, if there be periods of temporary lull, then attention could be devoted to the working of mail matter other than first class. The final argument made against this proposed legislation—that it might be costly—is entirely disproved by the following statement of the First Assistant Postmaster General, which appears on page 79 of the hearings on the Post Office appropriation bill for 1913:

Mr. GRANDFIELD. \* \* \* About 85 per cent of the carriers and clerks complete their tour of duty within 10 hours, and probably 95 per cent within 11 hours, but in some instances their 8-hour tours of duty extend over 12 or 13 hours, I presume.

Then, if 85 per cent of the clerks and carriers complete their tour of duty within 10 hours, as this proposed legislation provides, it is most unjust not to extend the same working conditions to the remaining 15 per cent. Manifestly, if the principle of an 8-hour day in 10 hours is found to be practical for 85 per cent of the force, it is equally practical for all the force and can be extended to all the force without additional cost.

The public, the great patron of the mails, has much at stake in this proposed legislation. The public demands expedition in the handling of the mails.

The commerce and trade of our country is dependent upon an efficient and expeditious mail service.

There is no economy in failing to employ a sufficient force of clerks so that the mail can be handled quickly.

Where clerks are compelled to work in excess of eight hours it is patent that the force is not large enough and that some important mail matter is being delayed. That 8 hours should be worked within a period of 10 hours is at once reasonable and fair both to the service and to the employee.

#### COMPENSATORY TIME.

Another important paragraph of this proposed legislation is that which provides for the granting of compensatory time off duty for all work performed on Sundays by letter carriers and post-office clerks and which reads as follows:

That should the needs of the service require the employment on Sunday of letter carriers in the City Delivery Service and clerks in first and second class post offices, the employees who are required and ordered to perform Sunday work shall be allowed compensatory time on one of the six days following the Sunday on which they perform such service.

This provision has so much of merit in it that it needs no defense. The American people believe that every person should have one day of rest in seven, and preferably that day should be on Sunday. However, there are unique conditions prevailing in the postal service which demand that some labor be performed on Sunday.

The principle involved was recognized by the last Congress, which enacted the following legislation in the Post Office appropriation bill for 1912:

That hereafter for services required on Sundays of supervisory officers, clerks in first and second class post offices, and city letter carriers, compensatory time off during working days in amount equal to



that of the Sunday employment may be allowed, under such regulations as the Postmaster General may prescribe, but this provision shall not apply to auxiliary or substitute employees.

This legislation was construed by the department to be permissive rather than mandatory, and the result is that in approximately 300 post offices of the first and second class the clerks have never received any compensatory time on week days for their Sunday labor.

There is no doubt that Congress intended this legislation to apply equally and fairly to all of the employees affected.

However, it seems to have been just loose enough in its wording to permit of misinterpretation. Many postmasters have so arranged the schedules of their employees that compensatory time for Sunday work is allowed in daily installments running as low as 10 minutes. Compensatory time allotted in this fashion is of no use to the employee whatsoever. Such an arrangement is but a manipulation of schedules to defeat the purpose of the legislation, which, no doubt, contemplated that if a clerk worked a full day on Sunday he should have a full day off on a week day.

I hope the House will pass the provisions of this bill to which I have referred, as well as others to which I have had no time for reference. They are humane measures, and businesslike as well. They will be creditable to all who have part in making them laws and will be of vast benefit to a large class of faithful and efficient employees of the Government. [Applause.]

Mr. WEEKS. Mr. Chairman, I now yield one hour, or such time as he may desire, to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MADDEN].

Mr. MADDEN. Mr. Chairman, this is a very exhilarating situation in which I find myself. I do not wonder that it is so, for the bill that is pending affects every house in the United States and every person who lives in a house, and it is because of this, I assume, that all the Members are in their seats listening to what is being said on the pending question. [Applause.] I should be delighted if some one better qualified than I to speak on this subject of such vital importance to the American people were selected when every Member is so interested. I do not believe that I am quite equal to the occasion. I fear that I am not. The post-office service is the greatest service of the Government. It expends a larger sum of money than any other service in the United States. It reaches more people than all the other services combined, and I do not wonder, in view of these facts, that every Member finds himself absorbed with interest in the discussion of the bill.

I realize that at a time like this it is only because of the vast interest they have in the discussion of this question that Members can keep themselves away from building up political fences or preventing them from being torn down. These are strenuous days. We are making Presidents, appointing and electing delegates all over the United States, either to select the Speaker of the House for the presidency, or some other man who is not yet in the public mind. We can not tell. To see the membership of the House so intense in their interests in the discussion of a great question like this, in the face of these politically strenuous times, speaks well for the patriotism of the membership in serving the people of the United States through the great postal service. [Applause.]

I wish I had the eloquence necessary to speak of the conditions affected by the postal service that the importance of the question justifies, but I have not, and I shall not attempt to place any flowery words in what I have to say. I shall attempt to call the attention of those Members who are present to the fact that one of the things in this bill which ought to receive more attention than it did receive from the committee is the compensation which should be paid to the men who do the lowest character of service in the Post Office Department, namely, the laborers. Every other class of servants in the post office service has had something done for them, while these men were ignored. I hope that when the bill is under consideration under the five-minute rule something will be done to increase the pay of these men. There is no chance for them to move up the ladder, because they are not subject to promotion in the classified service as the clerks and carriers are. They are not automatically promoted according to their length of service, but the work they do is not only strenuous but important, and some consideration ought to be given to them.

One of the things about which I desire to talk a little is the proposed legislation on parcel post. This bill provides for the reduction of the rate from 16 to 12 cents a pound, and the increase of the weight of the package from 4 pounds to 11 pounds, to enable the domestic package to be shipped from one point of the continent to the other on an equal basis with the packages that may be shipped from foreign countries under the International Postal Union Convention agreement.

The bill also provides that there shall be a so-called rural parcel post under which parcels up to 11 pounds may originate at the post office sending out the rural carriers into the rural districts, and the bill provides also that each of these rural carriers may take packages at intermediate points and deliver them to the destination at either end of his route. Everybody knows that this rural parcel-post proposition is not intended to give the service to the people which they are demanding. There is an attempt being made in the recommendation by this committee to satisfy the local village merchant who is opposed to the introduction of a parcel post and at the same time to satisfy the farmer who is in favor of a parcel post. The hope is that each one of these people will be so badly fooled that each will think he is getting what he wants, and at the same time that neither will get what he wants.

Personally I feel this way about the introduction of a parcel post. I think the Government of the United States is perfectly justified in using the post office as an instrumentality to distribute educational matter, such as letters, papers, books and magazines, and all things that will help to educate the people, but when it enters into the freight business and uses the Post Office Department to run a freight business, then I have some doubts about how it should enter upon the enterprise or whether it should enter upon it at all. Everybody must realize that if we enter upon the distribution of parcels to the people of the United States without first scientifically ascertaining just what we are going to do, how and what revenue we are going to receive, and how much it is going to cost to do the work, that we are not doing our whole duty not only to ourselves, but to the people.

I realize that there is an insistent demand on the part of the people, or a large part of them, for the establishment of a parcel post, and I realize also that there is an insistent demand on the part of an almost equally large number of the people that we shall not enter upon the enterprise. So it is an embarrassing situation in which we find ourselves. We find that if we are for the proposition we are opposed by those who are against it, and if we are against the proposition we are opposed by those who are for it. But we have a duty to perform as Members of the Congress of the United States. It is our duty to study the question, to ascertain just what should be done, and we ought not to inaugurate a new system until we have scientific knowledge sufficient to warrant us in judging just what the outcome will be.

If we establish the parcel post unlimited, we begin to realize at once that we must establish freight depots in every city in the United States in order to take care of the freight that will be handed to the post office for distribution. The establishment of these freight depots will cost a vast amount of money; nobody knows how much. The cost of distributing these freight packages will be large; nobody knows how large. The cost of transportation of packages from New York to San Francisco will be just the same to the person who hands the package to the Government for transportation as it will be from New York to Yonkers. Everybody knows that you can not carry a package from New York to San Francisco for the same price that you can carry it from New York to Yonkers. The price fixed on the package, according to this bill, is 12 cents a pound, and the number of pounds that you can carry is limited to 11 in any one package. Twelve times 11 is 132. If you want to send a package of 11 pounds in weight from New York to Albany through the post-office service under this bill you will pay to the Government of the United States \$1.32.

Everybody knows that the Government of the United States is not going to get the opportunity to carry that package, because the express companies of the United States will carry the package from New York to Albany for less than 25 cents, or not more than 25 cents at any rate. So that under the provisions of this bill the Government of the United States will be called upon to carry every package for long-distance travel and the express companies will carry the packages for the short distances.

Mr. LEWIS. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MADDEN. I will.

Mr. LEWIS. I do not wish to intrude—

Mr. MADDEN. I will be delighted. I am not as well informed on the matter as the gentleman, and I do not want him to take advantage of my innocence or ignorance.

Mr. LEWIS. The gentleman has just made a statement which sounds perfectly rational, and on a priori reasoning ought to be true, but in my judgment it does not happen to be true because of the anomalous circumstances surrounding the express company. The express company, on a 10-pound package from here to Baltimore, upon which it receives a rate of 25 cents, will get about 13 cents. On the long haul from here to

San Francisco on a like package for which it would charge about \$1.50 the express company would get 80 cents after paying the railroad for the haul. The services performed by the express companies in these instances would be practically identical as distinguished from the railway companies. The last thing the express company can afford to surrender under its peculiar situation is the long-haul traffic.

Mr. MADDEN. Well, I am very glad, indeed, to have the statement of the gentleman, who has made a very thorough study of this subject, and I am sure he knows more about it than I do, but I am stating the proposition from the viewpoint as I see it, without having made a very exhaustive study of it. I am stating it from the viewpoint of a man who can not see how you can do a service over 3,000 miles distance at the same price you can do it over 150 miles distance, and I have never been able to understand how the Government of the United States could get the short haul at \$1.32, on the 11-pound package, when the express company can deliver that package to its destination at 150 miles distance from a starting point at 25 cents.

Mr. CANNON. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MADDEN. Certainly.

Mr. CANNON. Is it not true that magazines and papers going at the pound rate are carried by the express company as long as they can carry at a profit, and the moment they can not carry at a profit then they unload on the Government, where it is carried at a loss? And if the gentleman's statement is correct, why do not the express companies carry 1,000 miles, from New York to St. Louis, or clear across the continent, or clear to the Philippines, if, according to the logic of the gentleman, Mr. LEWIS, whatever the fact may be, they would make more out of the long haul than the short haul, and they would not give it up?

Mr. LEWIS. Did the gentleman refer to me?

Mr. CANNON. I asked the gentleman a question about the gentleman's answer.

Mr. LEWIS. There is not any question, I may say to the gentleman from Illinois, that the profitable hauls the express companies have are the long hauls.

Mr. MADDEN. My understanding is, I may say with reference to the question of my colleague, that the express company carries magazines and newspapers to a point 700 miles or more from the place where they originate, and beyond that distance the post office carries them; so that if that be true, then the statement made by the gentleman from Maryland is not borne out by the facts. If the longer the distance they are carried by the express company the greater the earnings or the greater the profits, there is no reason then why, if his statement be a statement of scientific fact, the express company should not continue to carry from one end of the continent to the other, instead of limiting the territory over which they will carry at a given price.

Mr. LEWIS. The gentleman, I am sure, will pardon the further statement in order to clear up the situation. The express company in this country, on the average, receives 52½ per cent of the rate charged. The services performed by it do not increase in expensiveness with the length of the haul. It performs nearly as much service in the matter of expensiveness in the short haul as it does on the average long haul, and yet it receives the identical proportion of the rate in each case. On the long haul it gets about half the rate, and on the short haul it only gets half the rate.

Mr. MADDEN. Well, I can not understand why the express company can afford to divide the revenue with the railroad company when you also said that the railroad company and the express company are identical so far as the stockholders and a division of the profits are concerned. The men who own the railroads generally own the express companies, and while the express companies per se can not get more than 50 per cent of the revenue received, yet the men who are interested in the express companies get the other 50 per cent, so that they get it all between them.

Mr. PROUTY. I wish to make a suggestion rather than to ask a question.

Mr. MADDEN. I will be delighted to yield to the gentleman.

Mr. PROUTY. I wish to make a suggestion concerning the statement made here by the gentleman from Maryland [Mr. LEWIS]. Is not his logic faulty in this respect, that while express companies would be glad to hang on to the long haul, they can not control that? Is it not true that the man who does the shipping will be the man who determines by which route he will ship, whether by the mail service or by the express service, and that he will use the mail service when he can use it at cheaper rates than the express, and use the express when he can send it in that way at the lowest price?

Mr. MADDEN. Undoubtedly the economics of the situation will compel the man who ships the package to ship it by the cheapest route.

Mr. LOBECK. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MADDEN. Yes, sir.

Mr. LOBECK. The gentleman from Maryland [Mr. LEWIS] made a statement on the profits which they receive on a package from Baltimore to Washington and on a package shipped across the continent, but the percentage of profit is as great on the short distance as on the long distance, is it not?

Mr. MADDEN. The percentage is as great, but the amount is not as large.

Mr. LOBECK. But they will have more business between Baltimore and Washington than they would on the long haul?

Mr. MADDEN. Certainly.

Mr. LOBECK. So the aggregate of the business is what makes the profit?

Mr. MADDEN. And the express company will take the aggregate of the business. The idea of the parcel post, which gives the American citizen the same rate as the foreigner can ship at now, is not going to accomplish anything for the American people. No man will ship an 11-pound package, at \$1.32, through the post office if he can ship that package by the express service for half that amount, and everybody will concede that you can ship the 11-pound package for less than \$1.32 for a distance of 700 or 800 miles or a thousand miles. So that when an American citizen sends an 11-pound package through the mails he is going to be certain that he sends it to a point where the postage charge is less than the express charge would be, if such a condition exists.

Now, I grant you that the provisions of this bill might, and probably would, increase the number of packages sent through the post office up to 4 or 5 pounds, but when you get beyond 5 pounds there will be no increase in the number of packages sent through the postal service, because the 5-pound package costs 60 cents, whether he sends it 1 mile or 3,000 miles.

And you can send a 5-pound package by express, I take it, to any point on the American Continent for less than 60 cents. A 4-pound package sent to any point in the United States would cost 48 cents. The chances are that the express charges in a case like that would be 50 cents. And so the citizen would have a 2-cent advantage by shipping the 4-pound package through the post office. So while we pretend in this bill to establish a parcel post giving permission to the American people to use the mails for the distribution of packages, we are handing them a confidence game. I am not in favor of establishing any kind of a parcel post, or undertaking any other kind of business to be done by the Government of the United States, until we can do that thing with an intelligence that will enable us to see the outcome of the undertaking. There is no business man anywhere on the civilized globe that would establish a new branch of an already established business without ascertaining, first, what it would cost to put it into effect; second, what the business outcome of putting it into effect would be; third, how much money would be required to establish the facilities to enable it to transact the business in which he was about to engage. For you must remember that if the Government of the United States undertakes to distribute freight, the people to whom this freight will be distributed will expect good and prompt service. They will send their packages to the Government. The Government must have some place to care for them, and that will involve the establishment of warehouses that will involve the expenditure of vast sums of money, that will necessitate the appointment of new managers, freight clerks, rate clerks, route clerks, and all that, in order to be able to tell what to do with these packages and how and when to send them.

Mr. FOWLER. The question that arose in my mind was this: How would you tell in advance, or how would you estimate in advance, the cost of this work without first having some kind of an experiment with it?

Mr. MADDEN. Here is what I do in my business: If the manager of any branch of my business comes to me and says he wants some new machinery, and it takes \$50,000 to buy that and install it, I want to know from him what result he expects to obtain by the investment of that additional money. And unless he can show me with reasonable conclusiveness what the outcome of that investment is to be, he would not get the money. And no man who has been successful in business life in this or any other country ever enters upon any great business enterprise without first knowing what it is going to cost and what the outcome is to be as nearly as possible.

Now, here is what I would propose in this bill:

We propose the appointment of a commission to investigate the parcel-post business everywhere in all its phases; to ascer-



tain just how it has worked where it has been established, and where it has been established what effect it has had on the postal service; what kind of service the people get as the result of the establishment of this branch of the post-office business; how they are satisfied with it; whether it affects the post office by creating a deficiency, or whether it gives them a surplus. We must enter upon this from a business viewpoint. There is no politics in it. There can not be. We realize that there is a great demand for the establishment of a parcel post. Everybody must admit that. But, realizing it, we must also say to the people that we are studying the question, and we must be conscientious in our study of the question.

There is no doubt but that the parcel post is inevitable. It is coming. It may be that it ought to come. I do not say that it ought not to. It may be that it ought to come now. But regardless of the demand, or regardless of how insistent the demand may be, we have the responsibility placed upon us of studying the reasons why we should do the thing that is demanded of us, and if we can show the people who are wanting this parcel post that it ought not to be established until it can be established along intelligent, legitimate business lines, I take it that there is not a man, woman, or child in the United States who will find fault with us for doing our duty conscientiously as we ought to do it.

Mr. LAFFERTY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MADDEN. I will yield to the gentleman.

Mr. LAFFERTY. I would like to ask the gentleman what he considers the cause of this more or less general demand for a parcel post.

Mr. MADDEN. Well, so far as I am able to judge, I will tell the gentleman very frankly. We have a lot of very enterprising men in all the great cities of America who are engaged in the mail-order business, and they are really very enterprising and they deserve a great deal of credit for their enterprise. They will send you by express anything from a mule with a harness to a wagon that can be drawn by the mule. They buy the output of factories that make goods everywhere, and they sell them at cheap prices, and they send their catalogues on to the parlor table of every man who lives in a rural district throughout the land, and the two books in common use in the rural districts of the country are the Bible and the catalogue of the mail-order house.

Mr. LOBECK. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MADDEN. Yes.

Mr. LOBECK. The gentleman from Pennsylvania, who made a speech in favor of the parcel post the other day, said that these mail-order houses were enabled to sell their goods cheaper than the local houses because they bought "seconds." Do you think the Government ought to go into partnership with mail-order houses in putting out "seconds" where they illustrate them as beautiful goods and good goods in their books?

Mr. MADDEN. The people of the United States who have brains enough to enter upon great business enterprises have genius enough to place their wares before the American people in such an insidious way that even as intelligent a Member of Congress as the gentleman from Omaha is not able to see that he is being influenced by any of their advertising schemes.

Mr. LOBECK. Thank you.

Mr. MADDEN. And so the Government of the United States, if it does enter into partnership with these men, is not to blame, because the Government enters into such partnership through such men as my friend Lobeck, who has had wide experience in business of all kinds and who can form as intelligent a business conception on a proposition as any man in this House. Now, if he can be fooled in that way, why not other men who know as little as I do?

Mr. SAMUEL W. SMITH. If we pass this bill, or some legislation establishing a commission, how long does the gentleman think ought to be given them in order to make a satisfactory report?

Mr. MADDEN. This bill provides that if the commission is appointed a report shall be made within a year. Is not that right, Mr. Chairman?

Mr. MOON of Tennessee. In January, 1914.

Mr. MADDEN. They would be obliged to report at that time.

Mr. AKIN of New York. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MADDEN. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. AKIN of New York. Does not the gentleman believe that if I wish to purchase goods at some point 500 miles from my place and I can save \$5 by it, that that \$5 is just as good to me as to the man in the town?

Mr. MADDEN. I do not think the gentleman would have sufficient intelligence to be allowed to run at large if he did not

buy the goods in the cheapest place he can buy. Everybody concedes the right to buy in the lowest market and sell in the highest market.

Now, I have thought about this a good deal; perhaps not very systematically, but I have thought about it, and my judgment is based purely on moral grounds. I really feel a good deal affected by the possibility of the change which will take place in American life in consequence of the establishment of a parcel post. I can very well recollect when I was a boy—that was a good while ago—when in the great city where I live all the streets outlying the business center were lined with shops. The business center in our city is contracted into a little area less than a mile square, and we have a city of 200 square miles in area, with a population of two and one-half millions of people. I recollect when every street outlying this business center was lined with shops, one shop having hardware, the next saddlery and leather goods, and others having dry goods, boots and shoes, millinery, clothing, and all the various kinds of business, each shop dealing in one kind of business or goods. I remember when those streets were lined with these shops, when everything looked clean and bright, and everybody looked happy and prosperous. The boys and girls living in the neighborhood of these shops were employed by the proprietors of the shops, perhaps no shop employing more than 10 or 15 or 20 boys and girls, and some as few as 1 or 2. The customers of the shops were the neighbors who lived around them. The boys and girls who were clerks there got a small or a large trade from their neighbors, depending upon their behavior. The proprietor of the shop was in close harmony with his employees. He took an interest in their welfare. Their neighbors did the same thing. We had a better moral condition then than we had later, or than we have now.

After awhile the idea of department stores entered the mind of some great money holder. He established a department store; he put stalls in his store under this one roof. In one stall he sold dry goods, in the next stall clothing, in the next stall hardware, in the next stall drugs. Next we find the proprietor of one of these outlying stores was obliged to sell his stock. His trade had gone to the department store. He was obliged to look for a job as manager of one of these departments. He was no longer an employer of labor; no longer in business for himself. He became an employee of one of these great department stores. The neighborhood in which he had done business before began to run down. The revenue that was received by the owner of the little building fell off. The neighborhood deteriorated. The boys and girls who were employed in this shop were obliged to go and look for jobs in the department store. Almost invariably they found employment there, but at lower wages. There was nobody in the ownership of the department store who knew the boy or the girl. Each one was checked into the store every morning and out every night like a piece of baggage. There was nobody there to look after their moral well-being. I can remember, when I was chairman of the finance committee of the great city of Chicago, walking along Madison Street one night with the chief of police, Maj. McClovery, now warden of the Leavenworth Penitentiary. We met a very beautiful girl who accosted us. We stopped and talked to her and tried to find out what she was doing walking the streets and what she did for a living during the day. She told us that she was employed by one of the greatest department stores in the world, the greatest department store on earth, employing not less than 15,000 men and women as clerks and doing the greatest business of anything of its kind anywhere. She said that the compensation she received for her work there was so small that she was not able to make a living by it. We went the next day to the proprietor of that store and told him the story. It was a heart-rending story, and I have remembered it ever since, and my heart bleeds at the condition which I then found and which I fear will prevail to a larger extent if we enter upon this enterprise of a parcel post. [Applause.]

What do you do? In every country town you take away the communication between the village and the man who lives on the farm. You do away with the community life. Ah, but you say, in your mercenary way, that this cheapens the distribution of the commodities and the necessities of life. But if you cheapen and degrade and demoralize life with it, what have you gained by the saving of a filthy dollar? Do you put the dollar above the man or the woman or the boy? Are you going to place the dollar above the morals of the Nation? Are you going to stand here in your mercenary way and say to the American people, "We are cowards, and afraid to express our views on a great question that may affect the morals of every community in the land in the future"? What I fear is that the same thing

in a more extensive way will happen through the mail-order houses that has happened in the great cities through the department stores.

Mr. LAFFERTY. Will the gentleman yield for a question?

Mr. MADDEN. Yes.

Mr. LAFFERTY. I should like to have the gentleman explain what he thinks would happen if the express companies should reduce their rates, either voluntarily to the figure that those favoring a parcel post would perhaps fix as the postal rate, or if the Interstate Commerce Commission should be given the power to fix express rates, based on physical valuation, and that commission should then bring down express rates to what some of us think a reasonable figure, which will be offered as an amendment to this parcel-post bill.

Mr. MADDEN. Mr. Chairman, I am not trying to talk about this subject from a scientific standpoint, for, as I said in the beginning, I have not given to it the study that would enable me to speak about it from the standpoint of an expert; but I really believe that if a parcel post is established it ought to be established along scientific lines. It is not possible to successfully and profitably conduct the transportation of parcels through the Post Office Department at a flat rate from one end of the American Continent to the other. Somebody, somewhere, somehow, must sit down and figure out how far we can carry a package at a given cost, and then we must have the courage to fix the limit at that cost.

The Government of the United States ought not to enter upon the establishment of a freight business under which it agrees to carry every package that may be offered to it for carriage for any distance on the American Continent at a flat rate.

Mr. CANNON. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MADDEN. I will yield to my colleague.

Mr. CANNON. I believe the postage on a letter is 2 cents an ounce.

Mr. MADDEN. Two cents an ounce.

Mr. CANNON. And this small-weight mail substantially furnishes the revenue of the department—I do not know just the proportion, but two-thirds or three-quarters. That service, by law, we monopolize, both for the long haul and the short haul. Wherever a letter goes, if it goes in the mails, it must have a 2-cent stamp on it.

Mr. MADDEN. Except 1 cent in the offices where there are no carriers, for local delivery.

Mr. CANNON. Yes; and for circulars, and so forth. Now, I am not an expert touching these matters, but can the gentleman or anybody inform us whether, in conducting a parcel-post system, we can with wisdom and safety take the long hauls and lose the short hauls and do for these packages what we do for the letters? In other words, monopolize the parcel-post business and cut the express companies out entirely?

I take it for granted that if we permanently enact parcel-post legislation at this session of Congress that that is a material question for consideration.

Mr. MADDEN. It seems to me that if we undertake to monopolize the business at the same rate that is fixed in this bill and force the citizens of the United States to send through the post office their parcels at 12 cents a pound rate when they could send them by express for half that money, that we will not find ourselves very enthusiastically approved. Therefore I say that we ought to fix a zone system beyond which we will not carry a package at a given price. We ought to make a price within the zone sufficiently low to take the business away from the express companies, but as a matter of good business judgment and a matter of interest and fair dealing between the Government and the people who own the Government, the representatives of the people can not afford to say to the people that they must pay a fixed flat rate and must give all their business to the Government whether it be a long or a short haul in face of the fact that they can send the business on a short haul for less money than the Government can carry it. There is only one way to do this, and that is to get experts who can figure out exactly how far the Government can carry a given weight for a given price. There ought to be a price fixed for the carriage of a package within the zone fixed that will enable the Government to come out even in the enterprise, and at the same time to give to the people the facilities for the transportation of their packages at a price below what the express companies would charge. Then you have got it.

Mr. McKENZIE. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MADDEN. I will.

Mr. McKENZIE. In case we fix a rate by this parcel-post system, will not the express companies meet that rate, and will not the people have the advantage of the low express rates as well as the post-office rates?

Mr. MADDEN. All right; if we fix the rates that will force the express companies to meet us we have accomplished the object. It really does not matter to the people whether they carry a package by express controlled by the railroads or whether they carry them by an express under Government control, by the postal service, provided they can get them carried at a price they think they ought to pay.

Mr. LEWIS. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MADDEN. I yield to the gentleman from Maryland.

Mr. LEWIS. Mr. Chairman, I wanted to ask the gentleman whether the thought he had given this subject had led him to the conclusion that the making of the rates and regulations for the carrying of these parcels, whether under the form of parcel post, per se, or under the form of parcel express, was an administrative question and not a legislative question, inasmuch as he spoke of experts being necessary to properly adapt the rates to move the traffic?

Mr. MADDEN. Mr. Chairman, it is an administrative question if it is being administered by a man who has charge of a business enterprise that is not hedged around by laws which tie the hands of the man who is administering the affairs. In a great business enterprise the manager of the business has the power to go either one way or the other. If he can not go on a straight line, he can zigzag; but the man who is managing a department for the Government of the United States is edged to go in the direction which the law points for him to go. He has no discretionary power. So, I say, before you charge him with the responsibility of successfully managing the enterprise you ought to give him the power to regulate the conditions as they ought to be regulated from the viewpoint of the gentleman from Maryland [Mr. LEWIS]. Then I will admit that the gentleman's question as to the administrative features of this proposition is correct.

Mr. GARRETT. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MADDEN. Yes.

Mr. GARRETT. Mr. Chairman, this thought was in my mind in connection with the answer made by the gentleman from Illinois to his colleague, as to the meeting of the postage rates by the express companies. Of course, it is principally the rural citizen who is interested in this proposition, and unless your rural route is articulated in some way with the express company, it would be very difficult, it seems to me, for the express company to make a rate that would meet the situation.

Mr. MADDEN. There is a point that I overlooked, I am frank to say. The delivery, of course, has something to do with it.

Mr. GARRETT. Yes; in the case of a man 4 or 5 miles out from town.

Mr. MADDEN. I agree that would be a serious objection to the express side of it, but if, as a matter of fact, in fixing a zone system we make a rate low enough to force the express companies to deliver goods, even to points where they would not have to be delivered into rural districts, we would have done something.

Mr. GARRETT. Undoubtedly.

Mr. MADDEN. Mr. Chairman, I think I have said all upon this question that I ought to say. I think that the thing that should be done by Congress above all things in connection with the establishment of a parcel post is to get the information upon which we can act intelligently.

Mr. J. M. C. SMITH. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MADDEN. Yes.

Mr. J. M. C. SMITH. I would like to inquire whether or not as a member of the Post Office Committee the gentleman will explain to the committee here what investigation, if any, the Committee on the Post Office made of the rate fixed in this bill or the facilities for transportation?

Mr. MADDEN. I do not understand. I was not on the subcommittee that made the investigation for the establishment of the parcel post, but I read the hearings; and if I understood anything from the hearings it was this: That everybody who appeared before the committee made it less clear to the committee about what should be done with respect to the establishment of a parcel post.

Mr. McKENZIE. Mr. Chairman, just one question.

Mr. MADDEN. Yes.

Mr. McKENZIE. Are we to understand that the rates fixed in this bill were made simply as a matter of guess?

Mr. MADDEN. No. I will say to my colleague this with relation to the rates: There is an International Postal Union in which 23 countries outside of the United States participate, and to the conventions of the International Postal Union delegates are sent from each of these countries. They have the



power to fix the rates for international postage. They have fixed the rate, and it was the International Postal Union that fixed the rate permitting foreigners to send packages up to 11 pounds in weight for 12 cents a pound into any city, town, or hamlet in the United States. The Congress of the United States never took any action on that question, and this I understand to be the first time that any Post Office Committee has recommended the reduction of the rate to the rate fixed by the international union. As a matter of fact, the United States had nothing to say about it. We reduced this to meet that.

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Chairman, as I understand the rate per pound which is so much talked about, you can send parcels from far away into the United States for 12 cents a pound up to 11 pounds, whereas our own people have to pay more, and can send only 4 pounds. If the gentleman will indulge me to lay a foundation for a question, the number of packages which come in under the International Postal Union agreement would probably not be one ten-thousandth part of the packages that would be carried by the Post Office Department in the event we pass a parcel-post bill.

Now, as I understand the gentleman—and I want to see if I understand him correctly—this treaty for an international parcel post was a treaty made by the President and ratified by the Senate—

Mr. MADDEN. No, no; it is made by the International Postal Union Convention.

Mr. CANNON. I know. But where did he get authority; by treaty?

Mr. MADDEN. Yes; they made a treaty.

Mr. CANNON. Was it ever by legislation which passed the House?

Mr. MADDEN. No.

Mr. CANNON. Then, the House has, touching the international parcel post, abdicated its power to originate revenue bills, which is very strenuously insisted upon; but I do not care to go into that branch of the matter. Now, the gentleman is inclined to vote—he is on the committee—for the bill as reported by the committee?

Mr. MADDEN. I think so.

Mr. CANNON. That would try an experiment for two years.

Mr. MADDEN. That is on the rural routes.

Mr. CANNON. And would put the other into operation for how long?

Mr. MADDEN. There is no limitation upon the time of the other.

Mr. CANNON. No limitation upon the time of the other, but on the rural routes the rates are less.

Mr. MADDEN. The rates are the same, except that below the pound the rates are fixed at varying prices.

Mr. CANNON. At varying prices—that is, as I hastily read the bill—so that this commission is to make its investigation and recommendation by 1914.

Mr. MADDEN. By January, 1914, and the rural route will, if enacted as recommended by the committee, expire by limitation at that time if no other legislation were enacted.

Mr. CANNON. But in the meantime, if this legislation is enacted, we would be having an object lesson with an American parcel post the same as would come from foreign countries. We would be having an object lesson among ourselves.

Mr. MADDEN. Yes.

Mr. CANNON. And then, in the gentleman's opinion, we would be in a position to legislate with better knowledge than we have now.

Mr. MADDEN. We should be.

Mr. LEWIS. If the gentleman will permit an observation. It has been shown conclusively, I think, that the 12 cents a pound rate is such that the express companies get the short traffic, and I am equally certain that the situation is such that the express companies would make rates that would take all the long traffic. In short, that there would be no traffic to speak of under this 12 cents a pound rate. Now, will the gentleman tell the committee how he thinks under these circumstances we are conducting any experiment at all with the 12-cent rate?

Mr. CANNON. Will the gentleman allow me to put a question right on top of that, because it is along the same line?

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Illinois has expired.

Mr. LEWIS. I ask that the gentleman may be given 10 minutes additional.

Mr. WEEKS. I yield to the gentleman from Illinois 10 minutes additional time.

Mr. CANNON. Make it 30 minutes if he wants it. He is discussing the bill; the first discussion I have heard of it. I did not hear the gentleman from Tennessee, and have been so busy in my committee work that I have not read his speech. Now,

as I understand it, the express company is a public utility, and that as the Interstate Commerce Commission, sustained by decisions of the highest courts, can fix and are fixing the freight tariff with only one limitation that they shall not be confiscatory and, as I understand it, the express company is a common carrier, and if I recollect aright it is the duty by express provision of law it was not necessary, for that matter, that they fix the rates for the express companies; and if that is correct, while I shall vote with the gentleman and with the committee because they have investigated and I have not, but if that statement is correct, there is nothing needed except the activity of the Interstate Commerce Commission to make express rates what they ought to be.

Mr. MADDEN. Well, there is this, I can say in reply to the gentleman from Maryland and also to my colleague, that although the express rates may be reduced to meet the rate fixed for the transportation of packages through the Post Office Department, we must also bear in mind the fact that the express company delivers its package from one point to another and receives it there, while the United States Government will deliver it from one of those points to the other and then hand it to the servant of the United States, the rural carrier or the city carrier, as the case may be, to deliver it to the house, and that while the express company will deliver it to the house consignee in a city within a given radius, it will not deliver to a citizen outside of the city or outside of a given radius of any city, so that even though the rate be lowered by the express company beyond the rate fixed under this bill or any other bill that Congress may enact, the rate of the express company would still be higher than the rate of the Post Office Department because of the added service that the Post Office Department would give to the citizen.

Mr. WEEKS. Mr. Chairman—

Mr. MADDEN. Mr. Chairman, I yield to my colleague on the committee.

Mr. WEEKS. The gentleman from Illinois, in reply to a question from his colleague, has correctly stated that one of the reasons for making the rate 12 cents a pound was on account of the international rate. I think he ought to add, as quite likely he will agree with me, that there was another reason which moved the committee to take this action, which was, that the receipts from fourth-class mail, which is substantially a parcel post, now amount to between \$4,000,000 and \$5,000,000, and the department reports the cost of the service at a fraction over 12 cents a pound.

Mr. MADDEN. I agree exactly with the statement of my colleague, the ranking member of our side of this committee.

Mr. LEWIS. I apologize for this interruption—

Mr. MADDEN. You do not need to do so. The gentleman illuminates anything that is being said.

Mr. LEWIS. There is not anything that distinguishes the difference in price in carrying parcels, the statement of the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. WEEKS] to the contrary notwithstanding. The class of matter that he is talking about is mail business from half an ounce up to 4 pounds, and is not a line of data applied, as distinguished from this, of pound or weighty shipments. And no one knows in this country what it costs to carry parcels per se. Is not that correct?

Mr. MADDEN. In the face of the statement made by the gentleman from Maryland, to the effect that nobody knows what it costs the Government, does not the gentleman think it would be wise for somebody to find out what it costs the Government before we enter upon this great enterprise?

Mr. LLOYD. It may be true that nobody does know what it costs to carry a package. It is true that the Post Office Department, some two years ago, sent out a statement to the effect that it cost twelve and a fraction cents to carry a pound of fourth-class matter. Whether that is a correct statement or not I do not know. But it is a statement that was given out by the Post Office Department and is the best information we have on that subject.

Mr. MADDEN. Anyway, the committee believed, Mr. Chairman, that the domestic citizen ought to be given the same advantages that are accorded to the people who live in other countries with respect to the shipment of packages through the Post Office Department. That is the real crux of the situation now.

Mr. J. M. C. SMITH. I would like to have the gentleman inform the committee the kind of merchandise that can be transported under this parcel post.

Mr. MADDEN. Any kind of merchandise that can be put in a package of a given size. They limit the size of the package, as I understand it, under the International Postal Union agreement, so that if you can not get 11 pounds in a package of a given size it can not be shipped through the mails, but what that size is I am unable to state.

Mr. GARRETT. Of course, with these international shipments the tariff laws of the various countries interfere, and any package shipped from a foreign nation that comes in is subject to our tariff laws. But I want to ask the gentleman if he has any data to which he can refer me, where I can ascertain anything about the amount of these international shipments of packages?

Mr. MADDEN. I really have no information upon the subject that would enable me to give an intelligent reply to the gentleman. I wonder if my colleague on the committee [Mr. WEEKS] would be able to answer the question of the gentleman from Tennessee?

Mr. WEEKS. I did not understand the question.

Mr. GARRETT. I have wondered and have made some little effort, but not very much, I must say, to ascertain how much international shipment there was and how much of the parcel mail comes in here under this international postal agreement.

Mr. WEEKS. I have not the figures in mind. I can not answer it offhand.

Mr. MADDEN. I do not think any member of the committee was able to ascertain just how much the packages shipped from other countries amount to.

Mr. GARRETT. That would be interesting in the study of the question.

Mr. MADDEN. But we have a system of clearance between this country and other countries, through which the balances are settled by this country and by the other countries, and if the balance is in favor of this country the revenues coming from that source do not go into the treasury of the Post Office. So that while the Post Office Department may seem to have a deficit, for example, it might really, as a matter of fact, have a surplus.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Illinois has expired.

Mr. MADDEN. I would like to have just enough time to enable me to answer this question.

Mr. HILL. I would like the gentleman to have time enough also to answer another question.

Mr. WEEKS. Mr. Chairman, how much of an extension does the gentleman from Illinois require?

Mr. MADDEN. I would like to have 10 minutes. Then I will quit.

Mr. WEEKS. Then, Mr. Chairman, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman. He is entitled to all the time he wants. He is a member of the committee, and he is discussing this question in an intelligent way, and therefore he ought to have all the time he wants. [Applause.]

Mr. MADDEN. We have a system of taking balances. For instance, if the United States sends packages to a foreign country and that country sends packages to the United States, and our postage amounts to more than their postage does, the balance is settled in our favor by the country owing it. And the balance that comes to the United States, I may say for the information of the House—it being a revelation to me—although the work is performed by the Post Office Department and charged to the expenses of the Post Office Department and its management, yet the surplus revenue coming as a result of that work does not go to the credit of the Post Office Department at all, but goes into the Treasury of the United States, and can not be taken out and used as the ordinary postal receipts are used. And so, while I do not know exactly how much the aggregate of these balances in favor of the United States would amount to in any one year, I am rather impressed with the belief that during the last fiscal year it was several hundred thousand dollars. I am not stating this as an absolute fact, but just as an impression.

Mr. HILL. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield now?

Mr. MADDEN. I yield to the gentleman from Connecticut.

Mr. HILL. If the gentleman will kindly take up his bill and refer to page 36 he will observe that it is there provided—

That postage shall be paid on all articles, parcels, or packages entitled to transportation under the provisions of this act as matter of the fourth class on rural mail delivery route only at the following rates: One cent for each 2 ounces or less, 2 cents for more than 2 ounces but not more than 4 ounces, 3 cents for more than 4 ounces but not more than 8 ounces, 4 cents for more than 8 ounces but not more than 12 ounces, 5 cents for more than 12 ounces but not more than a pound, and 2 cents per pound for each additional pound or fraction thereof up to and including a total of 11 pounds.

That fixes the rates on free rural delivery packages at a total of 25 cents on a package weighing 11 pounds. That refers to packages on rural routes only?

Mr. MADDEN. Yes.

Mr. HILL. Now, if you turn to section 8 you will find it provides "that hereafter postage shall be paid on matter of the fourth class at the rate of 12 cents per pound." Is the 25

cents referred to an excess charge over and above the 12 cents or is it deducted from the 12 cents? For instance, provided the gentleman lives on a rural route could I mail a package of merchandise from Washington to his house and have it delivered for 12 cents, or would it simply go to the nearest railroad station and from there carry an extra charge for delivery?

Mr. MADDEN. The 12 cents a pound rate is a general rate, which carries the parcel to the termination, no matter where that is, whether in the city, to be delivered by city carrier, or in the country, to be delivered by the rural carrier. But the rural package is confined only to the rural route.

Mr. LOBECK. Mr. Chairman, may I ask the gentleman from Missouri a question?

Mr. MADDEN. Certainly.

Mr. LLOYD. Oh, I do not care to take up the time of the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. SAMUEL W. SMITH. The gentleman explained a moment ago that the balance, under the international arrangement, went into the Treasury and not into the Post Office Department. Is that in accordance with a provision in the treaty?

Mr. MADDEN. No. There is no law that has ever been enacted which enables the Post Office Department to receive the moneys from the international postal revenues. It is merely a matter of bookkeeping.

Mr. PAYNE. It simply goes into the general fund.

Mr. MADDEN. Yes; it simply goes into the general fund. But it is only fair to say that if it went into the postal revenues, like the sale of stamps and all that, the income of the postal service would show a greater degree of efficiency with relation to its funds than is sometimes shown by the annual report.

Mr. LAFFERTY. I should like to ask the gentleman a question.

Mr. MADDEN. Yes.

Mr. LAFFERTY. The gentleman has made a very interesting argument against the parcel post upon two grounds—first, that it would be impracticable at this time to adopt the parcel-post law because we do not know what it would lead to in the way of expenditure; and, second, that it would be a bad thing, if it was practicable, to have cheaper rates of transportation. I should like to ask the gentleman if he knows what is the nature of this American League of Associations, of which H. B. Lyford, of the firm of Hibbard, Spencer, Bartlett & Co., of Chicago, is chairman; E. B. Moon, of Chicago, is executive secretary; and D. I. Williams, of Marshall Field & Co., of Chicago, is general secretary, who are sending out literature and maintaining a junta at room 310, Maryland Building, Washington, D. C., and what is the interest of that junta in this legislation? The gentleman mentioned the greatest department store in the world as being inimical to the best interests of Chicago. I hold here a letter from this American League of Associations, of which D. I. Williams, of Marshall Field & Co., of Chicago, is general secretary, against the parcel post. I should like to have the gentleman go into that if he can.

Mr. MADDEN. I will say to the gentleman that I am not in the confidence of these men, that I have no relation with them in any manner, shape, or form, and that I am not able to answer the gentleman's question. I am not a seer. I am not able to see into the future or into the past.

Mr. CANNON. Will the gentleman allow me right there?

Mr. MADDEN. Yes.

Mr. CANNON. Does not the gentleman think it wise to follow his discussion of this bill as it has proceeded, to give information, and that it is unwise to get up some cry about a junta and try to switch the House to a prejudice by bringing in the plutocrats?

Mr. MADDEN. I have not attempted to argue against the establishment of a parcel post at all, if I understand my own attitude. I have tried to state the facts as I see them, realizing that at some time or other in the not-far-distant future we will be obliged to establish a parcel post. My contention is and has been and will be that we ought to have the information upon which to base intelligent action, and that is what I hope we will have; not only in connection with this legislation, but with all other important legislation that may be undertaken by this Congress. [Applause.]

By unanimous consent, Mr. MADDEN was given leave to extend his remarks in the RECORD.

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. Chairman, Clyde H. Tavenner has written some very interesting and instructive articles upon the subject of the tariff and the strike at Lawrence, Mass., and in his letters exposing the condition of the workers at the Lawrence mills and calling the attention of the public to the manner in which 92,000,000 of American citizens are being outrageously



taxed in order that a few greedy trust magnates may be still further enriched he has done a splendid work for the cause of honest and intelligent tariff reform and very much for the cause of the masses of the people.

These letters have so favorably impressed Hon. James T. LLOYD, of Missouri, chairman of the Democratic national congressional committee, that he has caused some of them to be supplied to about 2,600 newspapers in the smaller cities and towns of the United States.

I desire to insert some of them in the RECORD as a part of my remarks.

[From the Peoria (Ill.) Star.]  
(By Clyde H. Tavenner.)

It so happens that since the first attempt of this House to reduce the tariff on woolsens, and thus reduce the cost of living to every man, woman, and child in the United States, which attempt was made fruitless because of President Taft's veto, there has been a strike of 30,000 men, women, and children workers in the great textile mills of the Woolen Trust at Lawrence, Mass.

This strike revealed, to the utter disgust of thousands of Americans of both parties who had previously placed more or less confidence in the principle of protection for protection's sake, but who now stand ready to denounce it at the polls at the first opportunity, that those millionaire Woolen Trust magnates who have been coming to Congress and obtaining excessive protection on the ground they were paying "American wages" and giving fair and decent treatment to their employees, have been handing out pure buncombe and working a gigantic double-barreled conspiracy on both consumers and employees.

The revelations springing from that strike have demonstrated to the satisfaction of even thousands of patriotic Republicans in this Nation that those Woolen Trust magnates have used the high tariff on woolen goods only to enrich themselves. Having obtained a monopoly on the American market, the Woolen Trust has forced the consumer to pay exorbitant prices for blankets, underwear, and all kinds of women's and children's dress goods, and while growing rich beyond the dreams of avarice themselves they have forced their men, women, and even little children employees to accept starvation wages and have treated them almost like animals.

[From the Lawrence (Mass.) Eagle.]  
(By Clyde H. Tavenner.)

WASHINGTON, D. C., January 25, 1912.

Driven from pillar to post for explanations to justify the Payne-Aldrich tariff tax, stand-pat protectionists long ago waived the theory that the foreigner pays the tariff and now stand on the assurance to the people that a prohibitive tariff is for the protection of "American" workmen.

When Schedule K, which places a heavy tax on every article of woolen clothing worn by every man, woman, and child in the Nation, was up for discussion, Aldrich, Lodge, Smoot, and other special privilege servers of the House and Senate declared their principal motive in levying a tax on these articles was to "protect" the "American" workmen in the woolen industry.

Schedule K became a law, the prices of all kinds of clothing, made wholly or in part of wool, have advanced, and the combinations of manufacturers who contributed heavily to the Republican Party to have Schedule K framed and passed have made millions. But how have the "American" workmen been protected?

The strike of 15,000 textile workers at Lawrence, Mass., one of many similar illustrations which might be given, throws some light on the subject. It puts the lie to the statement that Schedule K protects the "American" workman, because the information shows there are scarcely any "American" workers left in the woolen manufacturing industry to protect. The mill owners have "protected" the "American" workmen by driving them from their employment with low wages and unbearable working conditions, and by filling their places with contract laborers from the south of Europe. Fifty-two different nationalities are represented by the strikers at Lawrence, and 45 languages are spoken there.

Bayonets and decreased wages for the men, women, and children workers, instead of the workman's paradise, pictured by Aldrich, Lodge, and Smoot, is the definition of Schedule K that the mill workers at Lawrence are learning by actual experience.

#### BRINGING IN CHEAP LABOR.

In view of the strike of textile workers at Lawrence, Mass., it is interesting to know how the woolen mill owners attract cheap labor to their mills. Congressman A. P. GARDNER, of Massachusetts, while speaking one day in the House, not on the tariff, but on the subject of immigration, contributed some valuable information. Mr. GARDNER is a stand-pat protectionist of the Aldrich school.

"For example," said Mr. GARDNER, "suppose I am a Syrian conducting a Syrian boarding house in the city of Lowell, Mass. Perhaps some mill sends down to me for hands. I furnish them at a somewhat lower rate of wages than is expected by ordinary citizen help (American help). I find recurrent opportunities to supply the cotton mills with Syrians."

"Soon I hear that another mill is about to make an extension, so I say to myself, 'Back there in Syria is quite a profitable mine for me.' Perhaps I go to the mill treasurer and get an advance of money. Perhaps I have the money myself."

"I return to Syria or I send some trusted agent, very likely a Syrian resident of the United States. In Syria a number of emigrants are gathered together, and they come to America, and either by direct or indirect route, finally arrive at my boarding house in the city of Lowell. I tell them that if they do not pay me back the money advanced I will have them arrested; that they must hand over the full wages that they get in the mill on penalty of imprisonment. Everyone knows how easy it is for a stranger to break the laws or the ordinances in a land where he does not understand the language, and they are held in terror of the police."

"Meanwhile I take all their wages while I feed them and keep them alive just as I would feed and keep a horse alive that I had imported for use in a livery stable."

[From the Rock Island (Ill.) Argus.]  
(By Clyde H. Tavenner.)

WASHINGTON, D. C., February 1, 1912.

Here is some more evidence of how "protection" does not protect the workman.

The following is an extract from an appeal sent by the 30,000 men, women, and children, striking textile workers at Lawrence, Mass., to William M. Wood, president of the Woolen Trust:

"We are of the opinion that you have had ample time to consider the demands of the men, women, and children who have made the American Woolen Co. what it is to-day. In view of the fact that machinery has been improved, the workers turn off more and more work, but they are not paid accordingly, even though the price of food, clothing, and shelter has in many cases increased 50 and even 100 per cent within the last few years."

"We, the committee, are willing to meet the officials of the company at any time and submit the grievances of the strikers. So if you believe in a square deal you will not refuse to meet with us, but will come forward at once and try to bring the trouble to a final conclusion. You must bear in mind that the fact that these men, women, and children have not gone on strike for light or transient causes, but because they could no longer bear up under the burdens laid upon their shoulders. The American Woolen Co. has within the last few years built several mills, which are paid for, according to your own figures, and the company has even in the worst of times managed to pay dividends."

"The workers are of the opinion that the only competition left is the struggle among themselves for a miserable job at \$6, \$7, or \$8 a week."

This is how Schedule K "protects" the workman, solely for whose benefit the Payne-Aldrich bill (according to PAYNE and ALDRICH) was passed.

Since the protectionists admit that Schedule K, which places a heavy tax on every article of woolen clothing sold in the United States, was designed solely to benefit the workmen in the woolen industry, and since the \$6, \$7, and \$8 wages paid by the Woolen Trust demonstrates beyond successful contradiction that Schedule K does not protect the workers, why should the American people longer tolerate Schedule K?

[From the Moline (Ill.) Mail and Journal.]  
(By Clyde H. Tavenner.)

WASHINGTON, D. C., February 4, 1912.

While 30,000 men, women, and children mill workers at Lawrence, Mass., were out of work because of a strike to prevent a cut in their \$6, \$7, and \$8 a week wages, Mrs. Evelyn Walsh McLean, mother of the baby that is heir to \$100,000,000, gave a \$35,000 dinner to 50 guests at Washington, the Nation's Capital.

The hostess at this banquet wore diamonds that actually cost more than half a million dollars. In her hair was displayed the famous "Hope" diamond, which cost \$180,000, and at her throat another celebrated gem, "Star of the East," which is even larger than the Hope diamond.

#### SEVEN HUNDRED DOLLARS PER PLATE.

The cost per plate at the McLean dinner was \$700. One item in the expense was for 4,000 yellow lilies imported from abroad at \$2 each.

One of the highest-paid mill workers at Lawrence would have to work 84 years to earn the cost of that banquet. The earnings of a dozen mill workers for half a century would not purchase the gems worn by Mrs. McLean. A Lawrence worker would have to labor 20 years to pay for the yellow lilies alone.

The strike of the men, women, and children at Lawrence, and the \$700-a-plate dinner at Washington is a striking example of conditions existing under a system of excessive protection in the year of our Lord 1912. Neither the Lawrence strike nor the McLean dinner are exceptions. They are but samples of many similar illustrations which could be cited if space permitted. Only recently William M. Wood, the head of the Woolen Trust, whose employees are now on a strike at Lawrence, was arrested for knocking down and running over a pedestrian with his automobile. When arraigned in court he was asked how many automobiles he owned, and his reply was that he did not know. Imagine a man so rich that he does not know how many autos he has on hand!

#### A WRONG SYSTEM.

Fortunes which make it possible for one woman to wear half a million dollars' worth of diamonds at one time and which enables a man to own so many automobiles he is unable to keep track of them necessarily come through the power to place an artificial price on the things which the common people must have in order to live.

It is significant, in this connection, that the tariff, the cost of living, \$700-a-plate dinners—everything but the workman's wages—have increased hand in hand, revealing the intimate relationship of one to the other.

[From the Macomb (Ill.) Eagle.]  
(By C. H. Tavenner, special correspondent.)

WASHINGTON, February 6, 1912.

There are two sides to the strike of the 30,000 men, women, and children textile workers at Lawrence, Mass. The big press associations necessarily can not go into all of the details of the situation, for the reason that many of these details are not, strictly speaking, "news." The desperate struggle the mill workers have experienced in living on \$6, \$7, and \$8 per week wages paid them by the Woolen Trust is one of the features of the situation that has escaped general attention.

When it is considered that every man, woman, and child in the United States is taxed on every article of clothing they purchase "in order that the workers in the woolen industry may receive a fair day's wage," the strike becomes of national importance. The conditions being revealed at Lawrence show that Schedule K is an absolute failure so far as "protecting" the employees in the woolen industry is concerned.

The strike is demonstrating that the only viewpoint from which Schedule K is a success is that it is making the people pay exorbitant rates for woolen clothing and blankets and making millionaires out of the men who contributed large sums to the Republican campaign fund with the understanding that Schedule K would be framed and passed by a Republican Congress.

In striking contrast to the \$6, \$7, and \$8 wages paid the men, women, and children mill workers and the proposed reduction of 22 cents a week, which is responsible for the strike, are the following facts as to the enormous profits of the woolen mills:

The amount paid out in dividends by the American Woolen Co. in 1902 was \$1,400,000. In 1911 it was \$2,800,000. The capital in 1902 was \$49,501,100, and in 1911 was \$60,000,000. The capital increased 20 per cent. Dividends increased 100 per cent.

Those who complain of higher prices of shoddy, of cotton where there should be wool to protect the human body from winter chill,

should know all about Lawrence, because Lawrence is positive proof of the big, double-pointed political lie of the year of our Lord 1912. The whole argument on which tariff protection is based is this: "You give us protection against foreign labor, and we will be able to pay American wages to American workmen." The strike at Lawrence, together with the report of the Commissioner of Corporations on the wage situation in the steel industry, which shows that men work under almost incredible conditions, reveals beyond the peradventure of a doubt that the whole fabric of the tariff protectionists is woven of the most sordid of lies and almost unbelievable greed. Protection for the purpose of creating monopolies for American manufacturers has proven unwise. The people are permitting themselves to be taxed for nothing. But will they see it?

[Reprinted from the Johnstown (Pa.) Democrat.]  
(By Clyde H. Tavenner.)

WASHINGTON, February 17, 1912.

As a result of the Payne-Aldrich tariff tax every person in the United States is paying from 30 to 100 per cent more for woolen clothing and blankets than the resident of Great Britain pays. And the woolen clothing put out by the American Woolen Trust is much inferior in quality to that sold in Great Britain.

William M. Wood, head of the Woolen Trust, draws down the bulk of the enormous profits extorted from the American people.

Marlen E. Pew, a newspaper man who will not write an article unless he has the assurance that his paper will publish the facts as he finds them, was sent to Lawrence, Mass., to make an impartial investigation of the strike of the men, women, and children there. This is what he wrote about Wood:

"The story of the career of William M. Wood, president of the American Woolen Co., provides a curious paradox.

"This man is the oppressor of 150,000 miserable New England textile workers; a few years ago he was one of them. He is pitiless in his fight against the 30,000 strikers of Lawrence; in his youth he felt the sting of hunger that these strikers now rebel against.

"Fortune has smiled upon him and he has grown enormously rich; he declares that \$1 and \$9 per week is enough for the men and women who spin the product of his mills.

"It is said of George F. Baer, the anthracite baron, that he sincerely believes in his famous theory of the divine right of wealth. J. Pierpont Morgan was born to large fortune and has never seen the poverty of the steel slaves of Pittsburgh, though it is inconceivable that he does not know that it exists.

"Other great captains of industry are so comfortable in their clubs and palaces or so busy playing with the foibles of society that they may never think of what is happening beyond the vision of their dividends. "Not so with Wood. He knows. These strikers are his neighbors. Their distress he sees. Their cries he hears.

"Wood's father was a Portuguese Jew immigrant. He labored in a cotton mill and died of tuberculosis, a disease common to cotton and wool spinners.

"The father's name is believed to have been Alphense Lehair, or Levalir. He changed his name to Wood by order of the mill bosses, who, in those days, listed their employees by name instead of number, and bookkeepers didn't like to fuss with strange, foreign names.

"William quit school when his father died. He got a job in the Wamsutta Mills, New Bedford. The boy was quick to learn. After a while he entered a bank and learned finance. Then he became treasurer of a Fall River cotton mill. He finally mastered the art of manufacturing and assisted in the introduction of shoddy cloth.

"Wood met and married the daughter of Frederick Ayer, who had made a great fortune out of patent medicines.

"Ayer had been buying mill stock, and the mills had not been prospering. He backed his son-in-law with millions, however, and, by a combination, adroitly managed tactics, including shoddy, Schedule K, and labor crushing, Wood made Ayer's fortune swell to proportions that made even the patent-medicine game seem tame.

"The son of the poor mill worker became a millionaire and formed the present Wool Trust.

"A few weeks ago he was in Washington banqueting the stand-pat Senators and Representatives and Taft's Tariff Board and pleading for tariff protection for his employees.

"To-day he is in Boston, giving out statements that trade conditions do not warrant meeting the demands of the strikers who left their looms rather than accept a cut in wages averaging only 22 cents per week.

"Wood says that no dividends are paid on the common stock of his company and only 7 per cent on the preferred.

"The fact is that the common stock is treasury stock, and the company has been stowing away an enormous surplus while the tariff sailing was good.

"Wood is a dark-eyed, black-haired, nervous little man, with a vain conception of his power to control men—his workers, stockholders, politicians, editors, anyone and everyone who comes between him and the desired result.

"Wood works desperately hard at his business game in and out of season. It is said here that he keeps at such a high nervous tension that he can not compose himself to sleep at night until a massagist has operated upon him.

"Are the American people willing to continue to contribute to Mr. Wood by paying more for shoddy than good woolen clothing sells for in England, or do they want the tariff on woolens reduced?

[From the Carthage (Ill.) Republican.]  
(By C. H. Tavenner.)

WASHINGTON, February 20, 1912.

The Woolen Trust, having found that bayonets would not compel its \$6, \$7, and \$8 a week workers to call off their strike at Lawrence, Mass., is now utilizing the hunger of little children as a club to force the parents to return to work at reduced wages.

This is how the trust is using its new weapon: Charitable organizations in several eastern cities, after reading of the desperate straits to which the strikers' children had been reduced, made arrangements to have hundreds of those children cared for in homes outside of Lawrence until the strike ended. Under this plan a few children were sent away, all of them going to reputable families.

With the knowledge that their children were being cared for tenderly, the mothers and fathers back in Lawrence gained courage to carry on their fight. Freed from their little ones' cry for bread, the strikers took renewed hope.

What happened? The trust magnates, realizing that if all the little children were sent away from Lawrence the strikers could longer endure the struggle, at once issued orders to the servile police and militia com-

manders to put a stop to the deportation of the children. These magnates knew that where bayonets, persecutions, unlawful imprisonment, and all the other ordinary weapons of big corporations in fighting unions might fail, there remained one thing which the strikers could not long resist, and that was the suffering of their own children. The millionaires knew that while strong men and women could suffer in silence themselves they could not long bear to see their children hungry.

Accordingly, the order was issued to keep the children there. Immediately a squad of soldiers went to the stations, and when the strikers arrived with their children many of the mothers and fathers were clubbed and thrown into jail.

Diabolical as this may seem, it actually is being done, not in Russia, but right here in the United States.

The Woolen Trust, be it remembered, is the most highly protected of all the trusts. It makes millions of dollars annually in profits on stock that is watered until it is soggy.

Query: Since Aldrich and Smoot declared that Schedule K—which places a tax on every article of clothing used in the United States—was passed for the "protection" of the workers in the woolen industry, and since these workers receive not protection, but clubs and bayonets, why should Schedule K be longer tolerated?

[From the Quincy (Ill.) Journal.]

(By C. H. Tavenner, special correspondent.)

WASHINGTON, February 22, 1912.

Nothing in the history of American tariff making has so thoroughly demonstrated the fallacy of the high-protection principle as the testimony of the Lawrence (Mass.) strikers before the House Rules Committee.

The Woolen Trust is the especial pet of the high protectionists. In order that this trust may enjoy immunity from foreign competition, every man, woman, and child in the country pays tribute. All along this trust has said: "We must have a high tariff in order to protect our workmen. We can't pay American wages if we have to compete with the cheap labor of Europe."

The Rules Committee of the House summoned some of the strikers to Washington, and in the same room where Carnegie and Perkins told how they juggled millions, this committee heard fathers, mothers, and children tell how whole families were forced to live on \$5 and \$6 a week paid by the highly protected Woolen Trust. The witnesses told how they were forced to work 10 hours a day, how they had to use "a sort of molasses" as a substitute for butter, how children had to go into the mills at an early age in order to keep the family from actual starvation, and how the constant demand of the mill owners was for more and more speed.

In the committee room sat some of the mill children. They were fresh from the mills, and a mere glance at them told more than spoken volumes could tell. All had pinched faces. All were poorly dressed, some of them having only a cheap sweater in lieu of coat and overcoat. All had dull, expressionless faces, in which there was no trace of color or animation. All of them, moreover, were slightly deaf, because of their work amid the fearful clatter of the mill machinery, so that at times the committee members almost had to shout to make themselves heard.

Among them was one little Italian girl—Camilla Teoli by name—who had caught her hair in a shafting and had suffered the almost total loss of her scalp. She was unable to work for a year, during which she received not a cent in damages or compensation. When at last she was able to get out of her bed, she went back into the mills at a reduced wage, because she wasn't as strong as formerly.

All the children looked worn and old, as though they had been speeded up beyond the limit of endurance.

These children revealed, as nothing else could reveal, that "protecting American workmen" is the last thought of the Woolen Trust. They stood as living proof that the motive in seeking a high tariff on wool was greed.

Now that you know the truth, Mr. Reader, what are you going to do about it? If you do not know just what action to take to make your feeling in the matter effective, here is a suggestion: You can vote against the party that framed Schedule K, and for the party that stands pledged to reduce the tariff on woolens almost one-half.

[From the Moline (Ill.) Mail and Journal.]

(By C. H. Tavenner, special correspondence.)

WASHINGTON, March 1, 1912.

That the "cheap foreign labor" of Europe, which the American trusts hold up as a bugaboo to frighten the workers of this country whenever tariff legislation is pending, is really better paid than the workmen in the highly protected Woolen Trust factories is shown by a comparison of the wage scales in the cloth mills of the United States and England.

"Cheap foreign labor" is the constant wall of the trusts. "We must have protection against this cheaper labor in order to pay our workmen American wages," they argue, and, then, as soon as they get the protection they immediately begin to gouge the consumer, and at the same time push their own wage scale down below that of the foreign mills with which they were in such frantic fear of competition. The following table will show what spinners are paid in the trust mills here and in the mills of free-trade England:

In England, full time, per week. In Lawrence, full time, per week.

MEN.		MEN.	
Spinners	\$9.50 to \$12.00	Spinners	\$5.10 to \$7.70
Twirlers	9.00	Carders	6.00 to 8.00
Warpers	7.50	Combers	5.10 to 7.70
Weavers (2 looms)	5.50	Drawers	5.00 to 7.70
Weavers (4 looms)	6.50	Cop spinners	5.10 to 7.70
Big piecers	5.00	Twirlers	5.00 to 6.10
		Mule spinners	5.00 to 14.50
		Weavers (12 looms)	10.00
WOMEN.		WOMEN.	
Adults (average)	5.00	Combers (adults)	5.10
Girls (average)	3.75	Drawers (adults)	5.00
		Cop spinners	5.10
		Twirlers	5.00
		Warp spoolers (girls)	5.50

Different systems are used in the two countries, but where a direct parallel can be drawn the rate of pay is shown to be in favor of the English workman. The American Woolen Trust pays its weavers by the piece, and this makes his average for attending looms about 83 cents per loom, whereas in England the same sort of workman, for attending two looms, receives \$5.50 per week, or \$2.75 per loom.



The Woolen Trust is the most highly protected of all the trusts. It has shouted this cry of "cheap foreign labor" so long that many people have come to think that the workers in American mills, working under what the trusts call the "American standard," are magnates besides their low-paid English brethren. The reverse is true. The Woolen Trust wants protection for the sole reason that through protection it is saved from foreign competition and thus left free to gouge the American consumer at will. The workmen in the trust mills, meanwhile, are given no share of these enormous profits which the trust takes from the people.

JUST LOOK AT THIS—CONSUMERS ARE BEING MADE THE GOAT AGAIN.

Anyone who thinks those millionaire Woolen Trust magnates at Lawrence, Mass., are increasing the salaries of their men, women, and children mill workers out of the generosity of their hearts—and out of their own pocketbooks—are mistaken. They are making the American people pay not only the amount of the increased wages, but every penny of the expense of the long strike.

"The people sympathized with the strikers" is the slogan of the mill owners; "now let them shoulder the expense."

Before any wages were increased the Woolen Trust magnates, who have been making profits of from 6 to 75 per cent on their investment, decided to advance the cost of clothing. And, as a matter of fact, the consumers began to actually pay increased prices for woollens and cottons in anticipation of the increased wages to be paid by the Woolen Trust before the announcement of the increased wages was made public.

Cotton prints, calicoes, and the like have risen in price at wholesale in New York City a quarter of a cent in the last 10 days, and mill agents predict the increases will reach 2 cents a yard.

This will make a difference of 5 cents in an apron and 25 cents in the housewife's dress. Men's clothing is going up, and women's and children's woolen dress goods are declared to be next in line. The increases, it is estimated, will bring approximately \$12,000,000 into the coffers of the Woolen Trust within a year. Thus an accommodating public will bear the cost of the strike and increases in wages.

The men who work such games as this on both public and employees are but a handful in number. They are just a few rich men who own or control the majority of the stock of the Woolen Trust. It is practically these few men, and they alone, who are the sole beneficiaries of Schedule K.

Again the query: How long are 92,000,000 American citizens going to stand for a wool tariff, which taxes them outrageously on every stitch of clothing they use, merely in order that a few greedy Woolen Trust magnates may be still further enriched?

[From the Macomb (Ill.) Eagle.]

(Special correspondence by Clyde H. Tavenner.)

WASHINGTON, March 27, 1912.

When a woman purchases \$10 worth of woolen dress goods, \$4.87 of that \$10 represents the actual value of the goods and the remaining \$5.13 of the \$10 the amount of the tariff. In other words, should the same purchase be made in England, where there is no tariff on woollens, the woman would receive the same amount and quality of dress goods for \$4.87 that she pays \$10 for in this country.

This is because of the Payne-Aldrich ad valorem tariff of 105 per cent on this class of goods. When the Democrats came into power in the House of Representatives they framed a bill reducing the tax on woollens nearly 40 per cent. Had this bill been permitted to become a law the price of woollens would have been reduced to every consumer in the United States. But President Taft vetoed the bill. The Democratic majority of the House now presents the bill again.

The President, however, will have less excuse to veto the measure than he had before. He declared the first time that a certain Tariff Board had not made its report, and that to permit a reduction of the duties might make it impossible for the woolen manufacturers to "protect" their workmen.

The Tariff Board has now reported, showing that wages in the woolen industry are as high abroad as in this country in many instances. Then there has been a strike of the woolen mill workers at Lawrence, Mass., which has revealed beyond argument and beyond contradiction that the Woolen Trust magnates have been fooling and cheating the public all the time.

The strike of the \$6, \$7, and \$8 a week men, women, and children in the woolen mills brought to light the fact that while the mill owners have been declaring they were "protecting" their workers by giving them fair wages and decent working conditions they have been paying them starvation wages and treating them almost like animals.

The last leg has been knocked from under the wool-tax argument, and President Taft has no excuse left to explain a veto of the Democratic downward-revision wool bill.

It will be impossible to fool the people again, whether they are Republicans or Democrats. The President vetoed the first wool bill, not for the welfare of either consumers or woolen mill workers, but at the behest of the millionaire Woolen Trust owners who contributed to his campaign fund. If he vetoes the newly introduced wool bill, it will be for the same reason, and the people will so understand it.

[From the San Francisco Star.]

(Special correspondence by Clyde H. Tavenner.)

THE SUGAR SCHEDULE.

WASHINGTON, March 28, 1912.

The sugar industry in the United States, according to the wall going up from protectionists, will be ruined by the bill removing the tax from sugar, reducing the price to the consumer approximately 2 cents a pound. This, then, will be the fourth time the industry will have been "ruined," according to protectionists—always according to protectionists.

The standpatters said the industry would be ruined when Porto Rico sugar was admitted free. But it wasn't. Then they said it would surely perish when Philippine sugar was admitted free, and gave up the same cry when Cuban sugar was given a downward revision. During this time of "ruin" cane-sugar production in this country increased materially and beet-sugar production more than doubled, but the price of sugar has never ceased to advance to the consumer. The wholesale price of standard granulated sugar on the day this item is written is \$5.85 per 100 pounds. One week ago to-day it was \$5.75; one month ago to-day, \$5.45; and one year ago, \$4.60.

Whether the Sugar Trust finds it necessary to increase prices to reimburse itself for the stolen millions it was forced to disgorge to the Government, following the exposure of the underweighing frauds, or whether the increases are actually justified by a shortage of sugar production abroad is considered a debatable question by many. But

the fact that the wholesale price of sugar in London averages 2 cents a pound less than in the United States the year around shows the advantage in favor of the consumers of the country where there is neither a sugar tariff nor a Sugar Trust.

WHERE UNDERWOOD STANDS.

Chairman UNDERWOOD, of the Ways and Means Committee, was interrupted in his speech against the sugar tax by a Louisiana Member, who inquired of Mr. UNDERWOOD what he anticipated would happen to the sugar industry of his State if the tax was taken off of sugar. Mr. UNDERWOOD stated that, in all frankness to the gentleman from Louisiana, that he did not know what would happen to the sugar industry of that State, but that he did know that the sugar production of Louisiana was less than one-tenth of the entire sugar consumption in the United States, and that he did not believe in the principle of taxing 92,000,000 people in order that a few sugar producers in one State might make more profit.

TWO SUGAR TRUST CHECKS.

When the bill to repeal the tax on sugar was up for discussion in the House ASHER C. HINDS, of Maine, arose and loudly proclaimed that the ledger of the Sugar Trust in New York would show that the trust had sent checks to the campaign managers of both the Republican and Democratic Parties. Mr. HARDWICK, of Georgia, replied. He said that Mr. HINDS had stated was true, but that the same book also showed that the check intended for the Democratic campaign fund had been returned uncashed, whereas the one sent to the Republicans had been cashed and spent.

[From the Cheyenne (Wyo.) State Leader.]

(By Clyde H. Tavenner, special Washington correspondent of this newspaper.)

RICH MEN BEAR SMALL BURDEN IN COUNTRY—OWN 90 PER CENT OF WEALTH AND SHOULDER 10 PER CENT OF BURDEN—SIGNIFICANT STORY.

WASHINGTON, March 25, 1912.

Is it just that the men who own 90 per cent of the wealth of the United States should shoulder but 10 per cent of the burden of taxation for running the Government?

The Democratic House of Representatives believes that it is not, and hence the passage of the excise income-tax bill, which levies a tax of 1 per cent on incomes in excess of \$5,000 a year.

This does not mean that all persons having more than \$5,000 must pay a tax on the excess of that sum. It means that those who have an annual "income" or "profit" of more than \$5,000 must pay the 1 per cent on the excess of \$5,000. It will be necessary for a man to draw a higher salary than \$5,000 a year or to have a capitalized sum of about \$100,000 before he is called upon to pay 1 per cent tax on that portion in excess of \$5,000.

This is class legislation, the standpatters and protectionists say. They were never heard to complain, however, of the existing class legislation which permits the burden of Federal taxation to fall entirely upon the shoulders of the masses, taxing the average man, woman, and child on every stitch of clothing they wear and everything else they must have in order to live, while permitting all forms of wealth to go untaxed.

The masses of the people produce the wealth, and by legislative advantage a few get possession of it, and now these few object to the transfer to wealth of even the amount of revenue derived from the taxation of sugar, but one of the 500 things on which a tariff is levied. They would prefer that the Government continue to tax sugar instead of wealth, because they eat no more sugar than the section hand or the mill worker, and, therefore, under the present system are compelled to pay no greater tax to the Federal Government than does the poorest man. These facts may read strange, but they are facts, and will not be contradicted.

The United States is practically the only one of the great nations to-day that raises practically all its revenue by taxing the people according to their needs and practically according to their poverty and allows wealth to go untaxed, so far as the raising of money to build battleships, maintain the Army, and run the Government are concerned.

If a fiscal system which requires a millionaire to pay no more tax to the Federal Government than the section hand or the factory worker is fair and just, there is no need of reform; but if such a system is unjust, the excise income tax is a move in the right direction to remedy it.

Mr. MOON of Tennessee. I yield to the gentleman from New York [Mr. AKIN] 15 minutes.

Mr. AKIN of New York. Mr. Chairman, my purpose in speaking to-day is to explain to this House the methods that have been employed by some of the postmasters and the Post Office Department in trying to harm me in a way. I have in my hand nearly 100 scurrilous postal cards that were sent to me through the post office, the sending of which was countenanced by the postmaster in the city of Amsterdam, N. Y. I propose to show by the report of the post-office inspector that the postmaster there knew all about it, but did not understand the rules and regulations, although he had been in office 10 years; also the methods that were employed in the Post Office Department to change the name of a post office which was named after my father 35 years ago, not upon his request, but simply as an honor to him.

Mr. Chairman, I have noticed in the newspapers for several days certain remarks in relation to myself and my attitude in regard to a change of name of the post office named after my father at Akin, N. Y. This action to change the name of this post office was instigated by one Arthur W. Kline, at one time employed as my secretary, but who is not now acting in that capacity on account of his disloyalty and unfaithfulness, monumental gall and audacity, and mental stupidity, which will appear from a letter which I have in my possession and which I will ask to have inserted in the Record. Since he left my service he has been endeavoring to justify himself in his actions toward me by writing certain articles for the newspapers in-

tended to place me in a wrong light. He also took advantage of the use of the post office for the purpose of sending me very nearly 100 scurrilous postal cards, which the post-office inspector who had charge of the investigation of the fraudulent use of the post office for that purpose found that the postmaster, who had been in office for 8 or 10 years, knowingly allowed to pass through said post office, or overlooked, by reason of his absence from the post office, at that time attending a political conference; and when his attention was called to this fact he crawled out of it by saying that he did not know what the rules and regulations were in regard to such matter.

Mr. WEEKS. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. AKIN of New York. Yes.

Mr. WEEKS. I would like to ask the gentleman if he is going to submit any evidence of what the postmaster to whom he has referred has stated?

Mr. AKIN of New York. I have the report of the inspector in regard to sending the postal cards.

Mr. WEEKS. Let me ask the gentleman if the inspector states in his report that the postmaster was away attending political conferences instead of attending to his duties?

Mr. AKIN of New York. No; but I was right there, and I know that he was not there, but was away attending a political conference. I filed charges in the Post Office Department so that the Post Office Department might be able to ferret it out. There were letters written by different men who were mixed up in the affair who said that Mr. Liddle was here and Mr. Liddle was there, and that they talked with him about matters in regard to the selection of a Supreme Court judge.

Mr. SAMUEL W. SMITH. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. AKIN of New York. I will.

Mr. SAMUEL W. SMITH. I would like to ask the gentleman how he was so fortunate as to get the report of the inspector?

Mr. AKIN of New York. That I do not care to tell. I got it in a perfectly proper way. I asked for it and got it.

Mr. SAMUEL W. SMITH. Whom did the gentleman ask?

Mr. AKIN of New York. I do not care to state. I state that with all kindness to the gentleman.

Mr. SAMUEL W. SMITH. I do not care to embarrass the gentleman.

Mr. AKIN of New York. Oh, the gentleman is not embarrassing me at all.

Mr. SAMUEL W. SMITH. But I do not understand how the gentleman was able to get the report of an inspector in that way.

Mr. AKIN of New York. If the gentleman will look back to the remarks I made some time ago, he will see very clearly that this man has had charges preferred against him and that the department has not done anything about it, and also that I sent a letter to the President of the United States asking him to take some action in the matter.

Mr. SAMUEL W. SMITH. But I am not interested in that.

Mr. AKIN of New York. Oh, there are very many things that you gentlemen are not interested in on that side, and especially in matters of this kind when they come up. [Laughter.]

Think of it, Mr. Chairman, a man who had held the office of postmaster for eight years paying so little attention to the office that he does not know the rules and regulations in regard to obscene and scurrilous postal cards, and yet this same postmaster is retained in office by the administration, which had been notified repeatedly as to this man's inefficiency and ignorance of such rules.

I also wish to have inserted in the RECORD the name of one other person interested in the changing of the name from Akin to Fort Johnson, who is no other person than a former Member of Congress of this House, by the name of Lucius N. Littauer, who became famous by his notorious and fraudulent transactions with the War Department just previous to the closing of Mr. Roosevelt's administration; and, although his transactions are public records, yet by reason of the thimblerrigging and the close affiliations and associations of this political beach comber, a man utterly distrusted, with whom no decent man would associate himself, and, furthermore, in whose company no respectable person living in his neighborhood would be found, whom no honest man would trust as far as he could throw a bull by the tail, I have been unable to procure the records from the War Department, as they are withheld by the department in order to protect this Littauer from exposure on account of his fraudulent transactions with the War Department.

To substantiate my position in reference to this man Kline, I ask unanimous consent to insert in the RECORD clippings from newspapers bearing their respective dates and copies of letters in the Post Office Department, as well as Post Office Inspector Daily's report in regard to Kline's questionable use of the mails to discredit me. It is not that I care, Mr. Speaker, what they call the village in which I live; I simply want to show the

motives of all the active participants in this move to cast reflection on me.

Furthermore, I wish to call attention, Mr. Speaker, to the brief prepared by C. P. Grandfield, First Assistant Postmaster General, wherein he claims that he told me the status of the case. I wish to call attention to the letter which I wrote to Mr. Grandfield, and then, by looking carefully at his answer, you will see that he did not give me the status of the case, and when he made that brief it was misleading and a falsehood; he did not answer the questions I asked him at all.

Mr. WEEKS. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. AKIN of New York. I can not yield now, as I have only 15 minutes.

Mr. WEEKS. I will yield the gentleman additional time to answer my question.

Mr. AKIN of New York. I will now yield to the gentleman.

Mr. WEEKS. Is the gentleman going to include in his remarks the letter that he wrote the First Assistant Postmaster General and the Assistant Postmaster General's reply?

Mr. AKIN of New York. Yes; I am. I am going to be perfectly fair with you people [laughter], and you will know it when I get through.

Mr. WEEKS. There are some of us people who are very glad to find out where the gentleman from New York belongs.

Mr. AKIN of New York. Oh, Mr. Chairman, I have not been at all delicate in stating where I belong in this House. I have stood in the middle of the floor here several times and voted as I thought was right, whether it was with the standpats on this side or gentlemen on that side, whoever they may have been. I am down here to cast a decent, honest vote when I think a bill is fair and decent, and I am not going to vote otherwise. I promised my people that I would not be coerced or intimidated from my purpose, from what I thought was right. [Applause.] If this hurts you people I can not help it, because it is true.

Furthermore, I wish to call attention to the letter from Lucius N. Littauer of March 6, in which he speaks of changing the village name back to Fort Johnson; from "personal knowledge of the people living in this hamlet" he wishes to assure the Postmaster General that "if he gave his consent there would be practically a unanimous vote for the adoption of the name of Fort Johnson." Now, I wish to say, Mr. Chairman, that out of nearly 200 votes in the village of Akin only 34 votes were cast in favor of changing the name of this village, the balance of the voters staying at home or being at work and unable to vote, as the election was held in the afternoon and not in the evening, when the voters could get out to vote.

Although I understand that Mr. Littauer has been made a delegate to Chicago to the national convention as a Roosevelt delegate, knowing him as well as I do, I think he will simply go there as a delegate for the purpose of seeing how much he can get, and not in the interests of the people of that district. This man, Littauer, has done more to debauch the voters of my district than any man who has ever been in my district in politics during my lifetime in that section.

Now, gentlemen, that is all I have got in here; there is no more harangue in this thing after this.

Mr. WEEKS. I am glad the gentleman recognizes the stuff that he has been reading.

Mr. AKIN of New York. I have sat here hour after hour and listened to nothing but harangue on that side. The gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MADDEN], who talked a few minutes ago on the Post Office bill, uttered nothing but a harangue. [Laughter.] We might as well all get in together on this thing. [Laughter.]

Mr. WEEKS. If the gentleman from New York had listened to the gentleman from Illinois who spoke last he would have got some information which would have done him good.

Mr. AKIN of New York. The gentleman from Illinois got up and made a statement that they wanted a commission appointed so as to get all this information; that he did not know anything about it. I made up my mind that the man who was talking without any information did not know what he was talking about. [Laughter and applause.]

These letters, memoranda, and data simply go to show that the conditions as represented in my former speech were true, and that this deplorable condition does exist in the district which I represent. I did not deem the matter of the changing of the name of enough importance to leave my duties here in Congress to go home and take any action in the matter whatever. If the people of my town wish to live in a village named after a man who, without doubt, as is shown by the documentary history and the colonial history of the State of New York, had no better reputation than the Indian trader of 40 years ago—this Sir William Johnson dealt largely with the Mohawks and Iroquois, as well as the Hurons and Senecas,



maintained an elaborate establishment, and made no bones of debauching the Indians of both sexes at this old place; was instrumental in egging on Chief Hendricks in his massacres of the Indians along Lake Champlain, and carried on warfare unparalleled in atrocity all the way north to Quebec—then it is their affair. Now, if under these circumstances, the people care or are inclined to perpetuate the name of this old monster, I shall be perfectly satisfied to bow to the will of the majority.

Mr. COOPER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. AKIN of New York. Certainly.

Mr. COOPER. How long has that post office been called Akin?

Mr. AKIN of New York. Ever since 1873.

Mr. COOPER. After whom was it named?

Mr. AKIN of New York. My father. Now, to show you, he owned 185 acres of land in this old farm. There was not a house except the old home on it, and by reason of his activity and his business management we have now on that farm a village of 700 people, and it was in honor of him that a former Member of Congress, Mr. John H. Starin, thought it was due him as an old friend to name the post office after him instead of calling it Fort Johnson. He had the same feeling toward this old Sir William Johnson that every other decent man in that neighborhood had. They all knew that he was an old debauchee—an old rake.

In one of the letters to the Postmaster General, written by this young man by the name of Kline, he lays great stress on retaining the name of Fort Johnson, saying that it had been called Fort Johnson from colonial times until the present time. If this smart young man would get the documentary history of New York he would see that it was called Mount Johnson and not Fort Johnson. Moreover, I have lived in this same colonial mansion myself since I was a little boy 3 years old up to a short time ago, and during that time it was never known by any other name than "The Old Fort."

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from New York has expired.

Mr. WEEKS. Mr. Chairman, I yield the gentleman five minutes more.

Mr. AKIN of New York. But there is a matter of history, not of colonial days, that perhaps may be uppermost in the memory of A. W. Kline's mind, and that is the records of the Akin schoolhouse and what became of the school moneys, and the partial recovery of the same by the committee appointed to collect the same, all of which he failed to notify the Post Office Department, was a matter of vital interest and history to the taxpayers of the village of Akin.

Now, Mr. Chairman, I have nothing else left but letters and data, and I ask unanimous consent that they may be inserted in the RECORD.

The CHAIRMAN. What is the request of the gentleman?

Mr. AKIN of New York. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from New York asks unanimous consent to extend his remarks in the RECORD. Is there objection?

Mr. WEEKS. Mr. Chairman, as I have yielded the gentleman more time and he has not used it all, I would like to have him state what the letters are, to whom they were written, and by whom.

Mr. AKIN of New York. One letter is written to Mr. BURTON HARRISON, a Member of Congress, by this secretary. There are some newspaper clippings. I do not think that is very fair. I am here the same as any other man. I have told you there is nothing in there but newspaper clippings and the reports of inspectors.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

The letters and papers referred to are as follows:

AMSTERDAM, N. Y., March 7, 1911.

Hon. FRANCIS BURTON HARRISON,  
Representative in Congress, Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR SIR: In view of the fact that President Taft has called an extra session of Congress, I am writing to ascertain if there would be any possibility of my securing a session job as a clerk to one of the committees in the new Congress.

While in Washington some few weeks ago I had the pleasure of meeting you with Congressman AKIN, from the twenty-fifth district.

I am to be in Washington with Mr. AKIN as his secretary, and would like to secure a committee appointment if possible. I do not believe that anyone can question my democracy, and if northern New York is entitled to any consideration in the matter of an appointment of this nature, I would like very much to have my name considered.

While I do not pose as the mouthpiece of the Congressman from the twenty-fifth district, and although one vote may not be of any value, still, nevertheless, in case of a pinch I would be in a position to help the Democrats out in case the one vote might be needed.

Thanking you in advance for anything you may do for me, I am,

Very truly, yours,

W. ARTHUR KLINE.

[From the Amsterdam (N. Y.) Sentinel, Mar. 11, 1912.]

The village elections in this vicinity passed off very quietly, there being but few contests. Perhaps most interest centered in the efforts of the opponents of Congressman AKIN to have the name of that village changed from Akin back to Fort Johnson. In this they were successful.

#### AKIN ELECTION.

The village of Akin by a vote of 34 to 8 has decided to change the name to Fort Johnson, some of the residents of the village taking advantage of the absence of Congressman AKIN and thinking to annoy him by submitting the proposition to a vote. The doctor didn't look upon the contest as of sufficient interest to leave his post in Washington to come home and vote. The little village has gained some fame through its prosperity as well as through its present president, Congressman AKIN. But Ethan Akin, for whom the village was named, appealed to Grover Cleveland, at that time President of the United States, and a quietus was placed upon the new name so far as the post office was concerned. Both Fonda, Johnstown & Gloversville and Central-Hudson Railroad stations will continue to be known by the name Akin. Congressman AKIN is understood to have declared the proceeding a piece of small politics, but he will undoubtedly pay his compliments to Postmaster General Hitchcock, whose sanction was given to the proposition to change the name, before the expiration of his term in Congress, which will not be until March 4, 1913.

[From the Amsterdam Recorder, Mar. 20, 1912.]

#### AKIN SAYS HE DOESN'T CARE.

A dispatch from Washington to the New York World says: "They can change the name to anything they please and I will not lose any sleep over it," Representative THORON AKIN said when he read that there is a movement on foot to change the name of the town in which he lives and which was named after his father.

"This town, which was nothing more than a post office, was named after my father 30 years ago," continued Mr. AKIN. "It has grown until it has a population of about 700. If my political enemies hope to make any capital out of this thing they can go ahead. I think it's pretty small politics, but I shall do nothing to interfere with their activities. I can live there just as comfortably and just as happily, no matter what name they call it by."

[From the Amsterdam Recorder, April, 1912.]

Another episode which, it is said, has detracted from the popularity of Representative AKIN was the institution by him of an action against Arthur Kline, of Amsterdam, formerly his private secretary, whom he accused of slandering him by means of postal cards. The action was brought before Judge Ray, in the United States court, and the impression is that it will not be pressed.

Mr. AKIN's speech was "extended" in the RECORD under "leave to print." Here is a paragraph from the speech:

"It appears, Mr. Speaker, that the reason given why Mr. Taft failed to make his promise good to me in regard to the appointment of honest men for postmasters in my district was made public by a pinhead reporter in a spineless paper which is printed in my district, and I am well informed that the parties who imparted this information about my not being good and not being able to trust me were Lucius N. Littauer and one Cyrus Durey."

[Scurrilous postal cards mailed at Amsterdam, N. Y., addressed to Hon. THORON AKIN, Akin, N. Y. Case No. —. Special. Office of post-office inspector in charge. Received Jan. 19, 1912, New York, N. Y. George W. Dally, inspector, New York division. Report examined, approved, and forwarded to chief inspector Jan. 19, 1912. Signed E. L. Kincaid, acting post-office inspector, in charge division. Received Feb. 28, 1912.]

POST OFFICE DEPARTMENT,  
OFFICE OF INSPECTOR,  
Utica, N. Y., January 18, 1912.

Mr. W. W. DICKSON,  
Inspector in Charge, New York, N. Y.

SIR: I have the honor to submit report in the matter of the mailing at Amsterdam, N. Y., on September 8, 9, 14, and 20, 1911, of scurrilous postal cards addressed to the Hon. THORON AKIN, Member of Congress from the twenty-fifth New York district, in violation of section 498 of the Postal Laws and Regulations, edition of 1902.

This case was given attention at Amsterdam, N. Y., last September, in accordance with instruction from you under date of September 18, addressed to me at Ticonderoga, N. Y., following personal complaint to you by Representative AKIN.

The objectionable postal cards, 84 in number, were addressed and delivered to complainant at Akin, N. Y. None have been mailed or received since September 20. Complainant accused W. Arthur Kline, a young attorney of Amsterdam, N. Y., who was formerly his secretary, with having written and mailed and with having caused same to be written and mailed. He is very familiar with Kline's handwriting, recognizes the writing on some of the cards as his, and can and did swear to that fact. A comparison of the handwriting on the cards, where same have been written by Kline as alleged by complainant, with Kline's handwriting to be found on the records of the village of Akin, N. Y., kept by him while clerk of the village prior to his employment as the Congressman's secretary, apparently warrants the charge that Kline wrote some of the cards. Although the writing on the cards in question is disguised, yet there is a strong similarity, in many instances, to Kline's known chirography. A noticeable peculiarity of Kline's, in finishing a sentence, is to use a colon and a dash instead of a period. This peculiarity is noticed in many instances on the scurrilous cards, whether they have been prepared by hand or on the typewriter, as many were; but under the rules of procedure in the United States court the village records of Akin and other samples of Kline's handwriting, which had no bearing on the matter at issue, could not be submitted to the grand jury for comparison.

No direct evidence could be secured to fasten the offense on Kline. There is no doubt of his guilt, but evidence to support that belief could not be developed. None at the post office at Amsterdam knew anything as to the identity of the writer or mailer. Efforts on my part to get in touch with Kline to interview him were unsuccessful, and a clerk from his office, who was supposed to have knowledge of the affair, was called to testify before the grand jury, but failed to contribute anything.

These cards should never have been permitted to go through to destination. They should have been withdrawn at mailing office, as their scurrilous nature was apparent in most cases on the face of the card.

The clerks in the Amsterdam office who handled them take refuge in the statement that they supposed the unavailability of post cards depended only on their obscurity or suggestiveness. The clerks and the postmaster pleaded ignorance of the regulations as applied to scurrilous matter.

The facts in the case were submitted to the United States attorney for the northern district of New York, at Binghamton, September 23 last, and the case was submitted to the grand jury at an adjourned term of the court which convened at Utica, N. Y., on the 16th instant. It failed to return a bill, and this action is final.

Mr. AKIN desires that the cards be returned to him. The United States attorney has no objection to their return to him. Other papers submitted by complainant are in the United States attorney's files and can be secured from him direct if desired.

I recommend the return of the post and postal cards, which are transmitted with this report to Representative AKIN in accordance with his request, and that the case be closed.

Very respectfully,

GEORGE W. DAILY,  
Post Office Inspector.

# BRIEF.

W. A. Kline asked about changing name to Fort Johnson March 20, 1912.

Name "Fort Johnson" approved March 1, 1912.

W. A. Kline again asks about changing name February 28, 1912.

W. A. Kline told no objection to name "Fort Johnson" March 2, 1912.

Hon. L. N. LITTAUER recommended change of name March 4, 1912.

Hon. L. N. LITTAUER told no objection to changing name March 8, 1912.

Representative AKIN asked if order had been issued for change of name March 8, 1912.

Representative AKIN told status March 12, 1912.

Certification of the change of name of the village March 25, 1912.

W. A. Kline asked to state if they desire name of post office changed.

W. A. Kline requests name of post office be changed April 1, 1912.

VILLAGE OF FORT JOHNSON, N. Y.,  
Office of Clerk, April 1, 1912.

C. P. GRANDFIELD, Esq.,

First Assistant Postmaster General,  
Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR SIR: I have your favor of the 30th in regard to matter of change of name of post office at Akin, N. Y. The communication to which you refer as of date March 25, 1912, was to notify your department of the result of the election on the proposition to change the name of the village to Fort Johnson and a request that the post office be also changed. From the reading of the communication received from the Postmaster General, under date of March 2, 1912, I deemed that was all that was necessary to bring about the desired result. If I have failed to supply your department with any information in regard to the matter, kindly let me know and I will gladly furnish the same.

Very truly, yours,

W. ARTHUR KLINE.

MARCH 30, 1912.

Mr. W. ARTHUR KLINE,

Clerk Village of Akin, N. Y.

MY DEAR SIR: In reply to a communication dated the 25th instant, which the Postmaster General has referred to me, signed by yourself and the president of the village of Akin, in which you certify that the name of the village has been changed to Fort Johnson, you are requested to state whether your communication was intended as a request that the name of the post office at Akin be changed to agree with the present name of the village.

Very truly, yours,

C. P. GRANDFIELD,  
First Assistant Postmaster General.

# NOTICE PURSUANT TO NO. 347 OF VILLAGE LAWS.

[Received March 27, 1912, Postmaster General. First Assistant, received March 28, 1912, Postmaster General.]

To Hon. F. H. HITCHCOCK, Esq.,  
Postmaster General, Washington, D. C.:

This is to certify that at the annual election held in the village of Akin, Montgomery County, N. Y., on the 19th day of March, 1912, the proposition, duly submitted pursuant to the provisions of section 347 of the village law, as found in Consolidated Laws of the State of New York, to change the name of the village from Akin to Fort Johnson was adopted.

In witness whereof we have hereunto set our hands and the seal of the village this 25th day of March, 1912.

JOHN K. MERGNER, President.  
W. ARTHUR KLINE, Village Clerk.

[SEAL OF VILLAGE.]

MARCH 8, 1912.

Hon. LUCIUS N. LITTAUER,

122 South Main Street, Gloversville, N. Y.

MY DEAR MR. LITTAUER: I beg to acknowledge the receipt of your letter of the 4th instant, with reference to changing the name of the village of Akin, Montgomery County, N. Y., to Fort Johnson, and to inform you that, so far as the department is concerned, there appears to be no objection to changing the name of the post office at that place to Fort Johnson, and I have therefore given my formal consent to the change of name of the village in accordance with the provision of the laws of the State of New York.

Yours, very truly,

F. H. HITCHCOCK.

[Littauer Bros., Glovers. New York office, 715-717 Broadway. Received March 6, 1912, Postmaster General.]

GLOVERSVILLE, N. Y.,  
122 South Main Street, March 4, 1912.

Hon. FRANK H. HITCHCOCK,

Postmaster General, Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR MR. HITCHCOCK: You will have received a paper from the members of the village of Akin, Montgomery County, N. Y., to have the name of that village changed from Akin back to Fort Johnson, the name the village bore during the Cleveland administration. From personal knowledge of people living in this hamlet, I can assure you that, if your consent is given, there will be practically a unanimous vote for

the adoption of the name Fort Johnson, and I would be particularly gratified if you could see fit to gratify this request.

Very truly, yours,

LUCIUS N. LITTAUER.

MARCH 2, 1912.

Mr. W. ARTHUR KLINE,

Clerk, Village of Akin, N. Y.

MY DEAR SIR: I beg to acknowledge the receipt of your letter of the 28th ultimo, and to say that your letter of February 20 was duly received and that the matter of the propriety of changing the name of the post office at Akin to Fort Johnson in the event of a similar change in the corporate name of the village was given prompt consideration. There appears to be no objection so far as the department is concerned to changing the name of the post office to Fort Johnson, and I therefore give my formal consent to the change of the name of the village, in accordance with the provision of the laws of the State of New York referred to in your letter.

Yours, very truly,

F. H. HITCHCOCK,  
Postmaster General.

[Received Feb. 29, 1912, Postmaster General.]

W. ARTHUR KLINE, ATTORNEY AT LAW,  
BLOOD BUILDING,  
Amsterdam, N. Y., February 28, 1912.

Hon. FRANK H. HITCHCOCK,

Postmaster General, Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR SIR: On February 20 I directed a letter to you of which the inclosed is a copy. Having received no reply or acknowledgment of the same I have concluded that the same failed to reach your office. For the past month there has been a series of robberies at the Amsterdam post office—a great deal of first-class mail had been stolen. The thief when apprehended confessed to stealing a great many letters and destroying the same after ascertaining that they contained nothing of value. Laboring under the impression that the letter of mine might have been thus destroyed and wishing to be on the safe side I am inclosing copy of same as above indicated.

Very truly, yours,

W. ARTHUR KLINE,  
Village Clerk.

[Copy of letter inclosed in above. Received Feb. 29, 1912, Postmaster General.]

FEBRUARY 20, 1912.

Hon. FRANK H. HITCHCOCK,

Postmaster General, Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: At a meeting of the trustees of the village of Akin, N. Y., held on the 19th day of February, 1912, the following resolution was adopted:

By Trustee Charles Wood:

"Resolved, That at the annual election to be held on the 19th day of March, 1912, the following proposition be submitted to the electors of the village to be voted upon:

"Shall the name of the village of Akin, N. Y., be changed from Akin to Fort Johnson?"

Carried. All voting "Aye."

Under the provisions of section 347 of the village law, as found in the Consolidated Laws of the State of New York, before this question can be officially placed upon the ballot at the annual election it is necessary that the written consent of the Postmaster General of the United States accompany the same.

I am therefore requested to present this matter to you for your consideration. As you are probably aware, within the boundaries of this village is situated the old colonial fort built and occupied as a residence by Sir William Johnson during his term of office as commissioner of Indian affairs, just prior to the Revolution. This fort is now the property of the Montgomery County Historical Society, and the residents of the village are desirous of changing the name for the purpose of handing down to the future generations the old colonial name of the village.

As you will note from the resolution as adopted, the village election will be held on the 19th of March, 1912, and in order to vote upon this question it will be necessary for the consent to change from your office shall be in my hands, as village clerk, during the first week of March, so that the ballots may be properly prepared.

Trusting that you may see your way clear to grant this request upon the part of the village trustees, I am,

Very truly, yours,

W. ARTHUR KLINE, Village Clerk.

[Received Mar. 9, 1912, First Assistant Postmaster General.]

MARCH 8, 1912.

Honorable FIRST ASSISTANT POSTMASTER GENERAL.

Post Office Department, Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR SIR: Notice comes to me that there is a project on foot to change the name of the post office at Akin, N. Y., to the name of Fort Johnson. Have you issued an order to change the name of that post office to that of Fort Johnson, and has there been any correspondence as to the change of the name, and who is the instigator of the project?

Yours, respectfully,

THERON AKIN.

MARCH 12, 1912.

Hon. THERON AKIN,

House of Representatives.

MY DEAR SIR: I am in receipt of your letter of the 8th instant, requesting information as to whether a change in the name of the post office at Akin, Montgomery County, N. Y., to Fort Johnson has been ordered. In reply, I beg to say that the department was officially informed that at a meeting of the board of trustees of the village of Akin it was decided to submit to a vote of the electors the question as to whether the name of the village should be changed to Fort Johnson, and that under the laws of the State of New York it was necessary, before the question could be officially placed upon the ballot, that the written consent of the Postmaster General be given. As there appeared to be no objection, so far as the department was concerned, to changing the name of the post office to Fort Johnson, in the event of the change of name of the village, the formal consent of the Postmaster General was given to the proposed change.

Very truly, yours,

C. P. GRANDFIELD,  
First Assistant Postmaster General.



Mr. MOON of Tennessee. Mr. Chairman, I yield 30 minutes to the gentleman from New York [Mr. REDFIELD]. [Applause.]

Mr. REDFIELD. Mr. Chairman, I desire to acknowledge the courtesy of the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. WEEKS] who has kindly yielded that I may speak at this particular moment, having engagements later in the day. As an Irish friend of mine said, I want to say before I commence that I agree most heartily with the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MADDEN] in his regret that this bill does not yet provide for the promotion and advancement of the laborers employed in the Post Office Department. I hope it will ultimately come so to do, and I shall be glad to join with anyone who will bring that about. I think it is the duty of the United States Government to be a model employer, and that it should open the door of opportunity to its humblest servants as well as to those higher in its service.

I am sure also that the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MADDEN] left unsaid one-half of what he had in mind when he spoke of the effect of the conditions of department-store employment and wages upon the young women in those stores. The other half I am sure he meant to say, and for him and in his behalf I want to say it in a moment or two now. I personally know four great department stores, one in Philadelphia, one in New York, one in Brooklyn, and one in Boston, the proprietors of which strain every nerve for the care of their working girls. On the minds of these men the rate of wages and the uplift of those girls is a moral charge. It never leaves their thought. One of them said to me one day: "Mr. REDFIELD, I would like to advance my 6,000 girls 50 cents a week, but I do not know now where the \$150,000 per year that that would cost is to come from." But by opportunity for promotion, and in every way he could do it, he strove to uplift those girls. And in like manner I know men in other cities who have esteemed it a privilege and a duty to strive to carry out the uplift of their employees to the full.

I want to speak, however, this afternoon upon section 5 of this bill, which has relation to the hours of work of the letter carriers, and to place before the committee certain facts collected by a subcommittee, of which I was chairman, a few weeks ago in the investigation of the post office at Brooklyn, N. Y., and which has not heretofore been made public. They have not yet appeared in the report of the subcommittee, because the matter was so large it has not been possible to get that report prepared, but they should be before the House in the discussion of this bill, which is directly affected by them. There are three distinct matters of which I wish to speak which affect the letter-carrier force in our great post offices. These are the matter of hours, the matter of the speed or the nervous tension under which the men work, and the matter of the weight those men carry, and on two of these matters I have before me official information coming from the department itself and acknowledged to be correct by the men themselves. I will first take up the question of hours, then, briefly, to which section 5 refers. I have in my hand the time cards of certain of the force in the general post office and in four stations in the city of Brooklyn during the latter part of February, 1912, and I read briefly from these cards, as it would be difficult to insert them in the Record without reading because of their peculiar form. I find the following facts relating to what are known as the "long tours" on the alternate weeks: One week these men work the straight eight hours. Their partners the following week work eight hours, and the man who this week works eight hours next week works what is called the "long tour." This results that on the 24th of February Mr. Paul A. Graw, attached to Station B of the Brooklyn post office, reported for duty at 5.45 a. m. and left duty finally for the night at 7.09 p. m. There is, of course, as you know, what is known as the midday "swing." That is, he actually worked from 5.45 in the morning until 9.57, when he gets a swing, and he reported again for duty at 3.15, and left at 7.09 p. m., or 8 hours and 6 minutes work, distributed, as you see, over a period of 13½ hours.

The next day the same carrier's time was from 5.45 a. m. to 7.13 p. m.; the next day from 5.45 to 7.10; the next day was a holiday; and again on Friday of that week his time was from 5.45 to 7.17, and he completed the week by working on Saturday from 5.45 until 7 o'clock, in each case with the midday swing of which I have spoken. In the same station, Robert C. Green, Jr., on the same day (Feb. 24, 1912) worked from 5.45 a. m. to 7.15 p. m.; the following day the same hours; the following day from 5.45 to 7.10; the following day was a holiday; and then on the next day he worked from 5.45 to 7, and on Saturday from 5.45 to 7.15. Thus I might read the whole of the cards for that station which gives all the details. I will turn now to Station S in another portion of the city, and I find Thomas J. McManus working on the 24th of February from 5.30 in the

morning until 6.25 in the evening, with a swing from 9.40 to 2.15. On Tuesday he worked from 5.50 to 6.20 in the evening; on Wednesday from 5.50 to 6.25; on Thursday it was a holiday; on Friday he worked from 5.50 to 6.35; and on Saturday from 5.50 to 6.20, all with a swing in the middle of the day. This statement may be said to be typical of that station also. Now, referring to the general post office—

Mr. WEEKS. May I ask the gentleman a question?

Mr. REDFIELD. Certainly, with pleasure.

Mr. WEEKS. I take it this is a residence section served by these carriers, is it not?

Mr. REDFIELD. Not altogether; one is and the other is mixed. The cards which I now hold in my hand are strictly a business section, and I brought these cards as representing two portions of the city in order that we might fairly cover the entire city. Now, in regard to the cards for the general post office, which is almost wholly a business section, I find that February 24 one Thomas C. Smith worked on Monday from 5.30 in the morning to 7.10 in the evening; on Tuesday from 5.45 to 7.10; on Wednesday from 5.45 to 7; Thursday being a holiday.

I find George J. McNamara working from 5.30 in the morning of Monday, the 24th of February, to 5.58 in the evening; Tuesday, from 5.45 in the morning to 6 o'clock in the evening; and so on in similar proportion in the general post office.

Referring, now, briefly to Station W, in the same post office, I find John J. O'Neil, on the same day of February, working from 5.45 in the morning to 7.12 in the evening—this being extreme hours—with the swing in the middle of the day. On the 26th of February O'Neil worked from 6 a. m. to 7.17 p. m. I have other cards showing a similar record from the same station. And, finally, referring to the Flatbush Station, almost purely a residence station and the one in which I myself live, I find James M. Ball, on the 24th of February, working from 5.45 in the morning to 5.45 in the evening, and on Tuesday, February 25, from 6 in the morning until 5.45 in the evening, again with the swing in the middle of the day, and on Wednesday from 6 o'clock in the morning until 5.40 in the evening. They worked in this station rather shorter hours, because it is more purely a residence district.

I will not read more cards, because they will be made a part of the committee's report, and any Member can see them.

That long service lasts for a week, and the length of the "swing" between the early and the late tour depends on the time when the carrier gets back from his morning service.

Mr. COOPER. What was the earliest hour at which any of them went to work, as you remember?

Mr. REDFIELD. Five-thirty.

Mr. COOPER. And that is understood as meaning that a man has to get up about 4.30 in the morning and get his breakfast?

Mr. REDFIELD. I am glad the gentleman asked the question. I asked witnesses under oath as to how these men got their breakfast, and was told they could not, of course, disturb their wives and children. They got up themselves at from 4.30 to 4.45, prepared their own simple breakfast, and got away from the house at 5 o'clock.

Mr. COOPER. And then they get home at half past 8 or 9 o'clock at night?

Mr. REDFIELD. I do not desire in any way to mislead the House as to the fact that these men in a given day of 24 hours do no more than 8 hours or within a few minutes of 8 hours' work. But each man during these broken days feels very keenly the consciousness that he has got to be back on his work, so to speak, and his mind must be upon it from 5 o'clock in the morning until 7 o'clock in the evening. And if there has been a heavy storm which has interrupted the traffic, I need not explain to this House the situation in which that man finds himself.

So much for what I may call the negative side of the case. The facts are admitted, because these cards were given me by authority of the post office. On the other hand, the question was asked, as a part of our committee investigation, How a change of hours would work? And I thought it was fair to have these facts under oath in order to pave the way somewhat for this discussion. The president of the local Letter Carriers' Association stated that it would be perfectly possible to arrange a schedule so that an 8-hour day within 10 hours' continuous time could be laid out without serious additional expense to the Government and without interruption to the work. And in that connection he pointed out what every business man knows to be true, that a late evening delivery for a business house is rarely of any great value, for any delivery in a down-town business district after 5 o'clock is practically worthless for use that day.

He was asked this more closely—the president of the Letter Carriers' Association in the Brooklyn post office was asked—if he would cause to be prepared a schedule based upon the 8 hours in 10, and did so. I received it only a few days ago. It forms a portion of the subcommittee's report, and it is here now in my hand and is available for examination by any member of the Post Office Committee or anybody who desires to see it, and fully works out any kind of tour—two trips, three trips, four trips, five trips, and six-trip routes—all of them based upon continuous 8 hours' work, and all of them showing adjustment to the necessary convenience alike of the business and the residential districts of the city.

Mr. WEEKS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman from New York yield?

Mr. REDFIELD. Yes.

Mr. WEEKS. Has that routine, as arranged with the president of the Letter Carriers' Association, been submitted to the postmaster at New York?

Mr. REDFIELD. No; and the gentleman's question, if he will pardon me, shows that he was a little misled. This was the post office at Brooklyn.

Mr. WEEKS. I supposed the post office at Brooklyn was connected with the New York post office.

Mr. REDFIELD. No.

Mr. WEEKS. Has it been submitted to the postmaster at Brooklyn?

Mr. REDFIELD. No; except that the question was asked in his presence and in the presence of his deputies whether such a one could be prepared, and it was prepared by a man in whom he has expressed confidence.

Mr. WEEKS. Did he agree that it was a practical arrangement?

Mr. REDFIELD. As yet I can not say as to that of my own knowledge.

Mr. UTTER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman from New York yield to the gentleman from Rhode Island?

Mr. REDFIELD. Certainly.

Mr. UTTER. Were these long carries, which the gentleman has reported, in the business section or in the residential section?

Mr. REDFIELD. They were in both. They cover substantially typical areas—six of them—all over the city.

Now, as to the question of hours, it is my judgment, Mr. Chairman—after examining that post office for several days and making careful inquiry of the carriers in several of the stations—that the question of hours presented by this bill involves no more than an ordinary business adjustment, and would do justice to the men who are fairly, in all righteousness, entitled to it.

Now, I want to take up for a few moments another phase of this same subject. What do these men have to carry in the way of weights? We had before us, under examination, the superintendent of mails, who is in charge of the 1,100 and more carriers who operate in that post office. The committee requested each one of three stations and the general post office to prepare slips showing the largest weight taken out by any carrier during this investigation on certain days, which we fixed without the authorities knowing what they were to be in advance. These slips were to be signed by the carrier himself and by the superintendent of the station, so that there could be no question as to whether they told the truth or not.

I hold in my hand the slips representing the general post office and Stations B, S, and W, on the 1st and 2d of March, and, referring to those, I will read very briefly certain questions addressed by me to the superintendent of mail delivery in Brooklyn and his answers. And in saying this I do it without any thought, expressed or in my mind, of criticism of the officers of the post office. That is not at all my purpose. I simply am desiring to make a public record of facts which relate to the bill now under discussion. I read:

Mr. REDFIELD. What do you consider the maximum amount of mail a carrier can handle on one delivery trip?

Mr. CARROUGHER. Why, on the three-trip route he should carry 40 pounds of mail.

Mr. REDFIELD. Do you know what the average load was that was taken out of the general post office in Brooklyn this morning?

Mr. CARROUGHER. I have an idea, but did not look at the figures, as I did not think you would want me to; but I have an idea that they would average about 60 pounds per man.

Mr. REDFIELD. Do the initialed tickets which have been handed by you to me, and which I show you, represent the loads taken out by the carriers this morning in the Brooklyn office?

Mr. CARROUGHER. Yes, sir.

Mr. REDFIELD. I call your attention to the fact that the tabulation made by Judge TOWNER from the slips shows the smallest load taken out this morning to be 52 pounds, and largest 81 pounds, or an average for 20 carriers of 65 pounds mail. To-day was not a day on which any

of the large publications had to be delivered. What would you say was the heaviest load a carrier would be obliged to take out at one time?

Mr. CARROUGHER. That is a very problematical question. A week ago Tuesday I weighed the mail on route 12, of which you have the corresponding weight, and he took out 112 pounds.

Mr. REDFIELD. Would it be unusual for a carrier to take out as many as 40 copies of the Ladies' Home Journal or a publication of corresponding weight on one trip?

Mr. CARROUGHER. That would be possible on several routes; not more than 10 in the whole office.

Mr. REDFIELD. And on those 10 routes that would mean an added load of approximately 40 pounds, would it not?

Mr. CARROUGHER. About that.

Mr. REDFIELD. So that if that route happened to be the one upon which these tickets which you have furnished showed a weight of 52 pounds a day, that load might become 90 pounds?

Mr. CARROUGHER. Yes.

It is hardly necessary for me to go through these tickets in detail, because the substance of them has appeared in the extracts from the testimony which I have read to you; but I hope that it may be possible to incorporate in this legislation a provision that a letter carrier shall not be required to take out at any one time over 75 pounds of mail. I think if it be considered that he must go in the stress of weather, without regard to what the conditions are, and that he must go on schedule time both as to his start and as to his return, 75 pounds of mail is all that a man should be expected to carry under such circumstances.

Finally, this that I shall speak about is a matter of individual judgment. It must be taken as meaning no more than that. I have been accustomed all my life to shops in which men working in considerable numbers have been employed. One gets a certain habit of knowing whether the men are overexerting themselves or not. It was my judgment, from visiting two of these stations at a time when work was progressing most rapidly, one of them the general post office, that these men were under high tension. In examining not 1 nor 2 nor 10, but more, that impression became very real to me, and upon inquiring of 3 of the carriers under oath as to that matter, they confirmed it, and their statements will appear in the record of the committee.

We have, then, a situation of this kind, that half the time in which those men are employed they are employed at hours which in their extremes may be said to be unusual and excessive. Then they are occasionally obliged—I do not say often—I do not know how often—to carry what seems to me to be excessive loads, and that they are daily obliged to work under what seems to me to be high tension. The nervous speed with which the work must be done is, to my mind, a very real factor in it.

And this must be always borne in mind, that they are not merely like the man who has so much ordinary work to do, but this particular work must be done with a very high percentage of accuracy. Mistakes are not to any considerable extent allowable at all. So that there is here not merely a physical but a mental tension, the tension of a keen mind directed to very accurate work. Under these circumstances, which I have tried to describe as simply as I could and very briefly, I have felt, and feel now, that this legislation, which provides for these carriers working 8 hours in a continuous 10, is in the first place practical legislation, requiring no serious trouble, causing no injury to the service, and occasioning no special difficulty or excessive expense in its establishment and operation. In the next place I feel that it is wise. We have a force of men that is, I think, admirable. The gentleman whose testimony I have read spoke with great pride of his working force. I believe the force is now somewhat overstrained nervously. I believe it ought to be so adjusted in these details that we may feel that these men are working within and not beyond their powers. [Applause.]

I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. UTTER. Of course, the purpose of the postal work is the public service. Did the committee take into consideration, from the postmasters' side, the question why they made this arrangement of hours? Of course, nobody believes there was a desire to make hard work, but it is a question of the public service. What did the postmaster say with reference to that?

Mr. REDFIELD. The man from whose testimony in part I have read was the superintendent of mails, the man next to the postmaster in that department. The testimony is quite voluminous. The arrangement I have read I have not read because it was exceptional, but because it was typical of the entire department in the large offices. These are in general, with a few minor exceptions, the usual conditions that prevail in the large offices. I want the gentleman from Rhode Island to understand that I am not holding any particular officer or officers accountable for the conditions. I think they have gradually grown up.

Mr. UTTER. I have not intended to imply that there was any intention on the part of the gentleman from New York except to state fairly the facts. Will the gentleman state what the



postmaster gave as a reason for recommending these hours? I understand that the postal carriers can only work eight hours in a day. Now, why is it? Has the public convenience made it necessary for the postmaster to make such an arrangement?

Mr. REDFIELD. In order, I believe, to get the largest amount of service at the least possible cost. I think they have, without meaning to do so, unconsciously "taken it out of" the men; and, if I may proceed a moment, there has been in particular post offices—and it was that fact which led to the inquiry—a very considerable reduction in the carrier force, with the result of throwing a larger amount of work on the men that remained.

Mr. UTTER. The conclusion of the committee naturally would be that in order to give the men 8 hours' labor within 10 hours it would be necessary to increase the force.

Mr. REDFIELD. I think it may not be. I think it may be accomplished by a readjustment, and I think the schedules which will appear in the report will show that fact.

Mr. UTTER. It is a practical question which can be determined.

Mr. REDFIELD. It is a practical question.

Mr. REILLY. Mr. Chairman, the gentleman from Rhode Island stated, in asking his question of the gentleman from New York, that the law now was that carriers should not work more than eight hours a day. That is not correct. It is 48 hours a week. They may work 10 hours to-day and 6 hours to-morrow.

Mr. REDFIELD. As a matter of fact, these cards are arranged for that very purpose in columns, which carry them over from day to day, the aggregate number of hours showing on a weekly basis instead of a daily basis.

Mr. FOWLER. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. REDFIELD. Certainly.

Mr. FOWLER. In the gentleman's investigation he has detailed for long hours for men, did he discover from that examination any physical or mental effects that the long-hour service had upon the employees?

Mr. REDFIELD. I must admit, Mr. Chairman, in answer to the question of the gentleman from Illinois, that I have not sufficient medical experience to be able to speak on the subject. We did examine three or four carriers in station B, who said that they were under a nervous strain and felt it. I think it is entirely reasonable to add that I think in the situation that the men work under at their desks preparing for the ringing of the bell—and the man who works toward the ringing of a bell is always under a strain—that these men standing at the desk and working with intensity, accuracy, and speed were under a certain amount of strain. I do not desire to exaggerate it, but I think it was really a strain.

Mr. WEEKS. Mr. Chairman, I now yield one hour to the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. STEENERSON] a member of the committee.

Mr. STEENERSON. Mr. Chairman, I want to congratulate the House and the country on the fact that for the first time in many years we have arrived at a point where the postal department is, at least, on a self-sustaining basis. There is a dispute between the Postmaster General and the chairman of the Post Office Committee whether there is a small surplus or a small deficit, but that is of very little importance. If we take into consideration the fact that the postal service carries all of the congressional mail and all the departmental mail from which, if it bore postage like other mail, we would receive a revenue annually of four or five million dollars, there is really a profit from the service.

Another thing that challenges our attention is the fact of the rapid growth of the postal business. Ten years ago the appropriations were \$123,000,000. This bill carries \$259,827,749, an increase of more than 100 per cent.

The increase is not only in the appropriations, but in the expenditures, at about the same ratio. The expenditures have exceeded the appropriations in every year except the last. The increase in population in the last decade was something like 20 per cent, whereas the increase in the expenditures for the postal service was more than 100 per cent. We are an industrial and commercial people, and the increase in the amount of our commerce is indicated by the increase in the per capita expenditure. There is a greater exchange of commodities, a greater diversity of industry, than there ever was before, and this necessitated an increased volume of commerce. The postal service is a good index to the progress and prosperity of the people. It may be a disputed question whether or not a postal deficit is a blessing or an evil.

When I first came to Congress nine years ago there was a postal deficit, and there had been quite a deficit for several years prior to that time. It had created considerable attention in Congress. In 1900 or in 1901 a commission was appointed by

authority of an act of Congress, known as the Wolcott Commission, to investigate the postal deficit and the cause thereof. That investigation inquired chiefly into the cost of carrying mail by railways, it being alleged that the prices paid by the United States for railway mail transportation were excessive.

After deliberating and after investigating for a couple of years a report was made by the majority that railway mail pay was not excessive, and by a minority it was. One of these minority reports was made by Mr. Moody, who was afterwards Justice of the Supreme Court of the United States. He pointed out the fact that the cost of carrying the mail by railway depended upon the size of the load carried on each car, and that where mail was carried in railway mail cars weighing perhaps 100,000 pounds, furnishing the accommodations of a traveling post office for several clerks, and carrying only two or three thousand pounds of mail, it necessarily involved an expense very much greater than if it was loaded with 4 or 5 tons or 6 tons, or, as sometimes happens in a storage car, with 20 tons. This investigation of railway mail pay resulted in no particular legislation by the next Congress, but the question came up in the Fifty-eighth, Fifty-ninth, and Sixtieth Congresses. We passed several acts reducing the railway mail pay on the heavy routes, where the average daily weight exceeded 5,000 pounds, and again we passed one that reduced the pay where a daily average exceeded 48,000 pounds, and we also made a horizontal reduction of 5 or 10 per cent. That seemed to satisfy the congressional mind for a time; but on the advent of the present Postmaster General the question arose indirectly in the discussion of second-class postage rates, which he contended involved a loss to the Government for the year 1909, I believe it was, of \$70,000,000. This was due to the fact that the rate per pound paid by the Government to the railways exceeded the postage received. The difference was so large that it exceeded by many times the amount of postage at 1 cent a pound collected from the publishers.

Congress, in order to solve this second-class postage problem, created a commission of inquiry, the so-called Overstreet commission. The department had extensive special mail weighings throughout the United States, a count of pieces, and an estimate of the distance that each piece or parcel was carried. After this commission had investigated the matter a year or so it found it could not complete its work, and so Congress gave it more time and also gave it authority to employ experts. The best accountants that money could hire were employed. They went to work and investigated the whole question of the cost of transportation of mail. An extensive report was made, embracing evidence covering thousands of pages, which, I venture to say, very few Members of Congress ever read.

We come down now to a year ago. The evidence was absolutely undisputed that the Government was carrying second-class mail matter at a loss. How large a loss was perhaps in dispute, but it was a very heavy loss, more than twice as much as was paid for the carriage by the publishers. The Postmaster General urged, in view of the testimony, a change, but the committee did not report any legislation. There was a bill pending, I believe, that failed to be reported for want of time in a short session of the Sixty-first Congress, which did not provide for higher rates; but when the appropriation bill came over to the Senate the Committee on Post Offices and Post Roads agreed upon an amendment raising the pay for second-class matter from 1 cent to 4 cents a pound.

That naturally excited the publishers, and a delegation of them came to Washington and had a conference at the White House. They claimed they had not had sufficient opportunity to show their side of the question; that these investigations had been one-sided; and they appealed to the President for an opportunity to show the facts. Of course I am stating this simply on hearsay. I was not present. I do not know what took place, but that was the general talk in the newspapers and outside. They claimed that if they had an opportunity to present the matter fully and impartially to an impartial commission for a decision they would be glad to abide by the result. The result of that conference was that the Senate agreed upon a provision for a commission, which was inserted in the appropriation bill. One of the commissioners, it was provided, should be a justice of the Supreme Court of the United States. When that came to the House the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. Moon], the ranking Democratic minority member on the Post Office Committee at that time, objected to having that provision in the appropriation bill, and it was finally arranged that it should pass as an independent resolution, and so the so-called Hughes Commission to investigate second-class mail matter was created. That commission went into the subject most extensively, and the Postmaster General, in his report of 1911, refers to the fact that this commission had been ap-

pointed and it had not yet reported when his annual report was made. He said:

The controversy over the department's recommendations on this subject had the desired effect of directing popular attention to the second-class mail problem, and the final outcome was the adoption by Congress of a joint resolution creating a commission to investigate the subject and make report. Extensive hearings were held by the commission during the summer, at which the officers of the department presented data in support of their contention as to the great loss incurred in handling second-class mail and submitted recommendations for a gradual equalization of postage rates on the basis of cost. As the first step in that direction the department suggested that the postage rate on second-class mail be increased 1 cent a pound, thus making a flat rate of 2 cents a pound, which charge should be regarded as merely tentative, however, leaving for future determination such additional increase as may be found necessary to meet the cost. It is hoped that the commission will look with favor on this recommendation and that legislation providing for its adoption will be enacted by Congress.

This is in the report of the Postmaster General. Now, the President sent a message here on the 22d day of February transmitting the findings of the Hughes commission, in which they found that the cost of second-class mail was more than 5 cents a pound. They do not recommend as high a rate of postage as that; they recognize the revolution that it would create, and therefore they contented themselves with recommending an increase to 2 cents a pound, and the President in his message to Congress said, and I quote from the message:

The commission suggests that the department "maintain an adequate cost system, so that the effect of the new rates may be closely observed and a proper basis may be secured for the consideration of any future proposals."

In these recommendations the Postmaster General and I heartily concur and commend them to the early attention of Congress. The proposed increase of 1 cent a pound in the second-class postage rate I believe to be most reasonable, and if sufficient time is allowed before the change goes into effect it should work little serious injury to the business of the periodical publishers, while equalizing, at least in a measure, the burdens of postal taxation.

All these investigations have cost this Government at least a quarter of a million dollars, and yet this bill, although it carries all sorts of new legislation, is silent on the question of second-class rates. It carries more new legislation than any appropriation bill I have ever known, and yet it omits the most important subject of new legislation, the most important matter so far as magnitude is concerned. I understand a year ago when our friends on the other side were in the minority that they favored an increase in second-class rates, but now that they are in the majority they are silent on the subject. [Applause on the Republican side.] Can it be that they pay any attention to the mighty influence of the newspapers? Why, bless your souls, no; they would not pay any attention to the influence of the newspapers and the magazines. [Laughter on the Republican side.]

The fact that there is a presidential election coming on certainly can have nothing to do with that omission. It must be simply a lapsus that can not be accounted for in any manner. But they do recommend postal rate changes, not on the subject that has been the burning question for all these years, which the Government has spent a quarter of a million dollars in investigating, but they propose rural parcel post and general parcel post. They propose here in this bill to change the rate for parcels and merchandise and to investigate the subject afterwards. How did it happen that this horse was hitched behind the wagon? Here we have investigated one subject for five years and forgot to follow it up with proper legislation, but on another subject we legislate in advance of an investigation. Why should there be such a difference between the parcel post and second-class mail matter? I am simply throwing this out as a suggestion needing some explanation.

Mr. MONDELL. Will the gentleman yield to me for a question?

Mr. STEENERSON. Certainly.

Mr. MONDELL. Is there no member of the committee present who can answer the gentleman's interrogatory?

Mr. STEENERSON. Well, I suppose they will in due time. I was not particularly anxious to have the interrogatory answered now.

Mr. MONDELL. I supposed the gentleman was insisting upon an immediate answer.

Mr. STEENERSON. Well, if the gentleman from Wyoming desires to come to the rescue of any of the members of the Post Office Committee—

Mr. MONDELL. I was not, but I was anxious to know what the answer was.

Mr. LLOYD. Mr. Chairman, I supposed the inquiry was a facetious query that did not need an answer.

Mr. STEENERSON. Well, I would not object to one, but I have no doubt the matter will receive consideration in debate that will follow. I did not necessarily expect to have it discussed in my time.

The gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MADDEN] discussed parcel post from one point of view. The gentleman from Maryland

[Mr. LEWIS] asked him some very interesting questions. I have no doubt that it is a fact, as the gentleman from Maryland said, that at 12 cents a pound, or \$240 a ton, there will not be very much traffic moved. I think the gentleman from Maryland [Mr. LEWIS] is absolutely right in saying that this kind of parcel post will not be effectual in relieving those who desire that accommodation, because it is such a high rate that for ordinary merchandise it will be absolutely prohibitive. It will not move at that rate by mail. Perhaps it might yield a profit.

Mr. LEWIS. Will the gentleman suffer an interruption at that point? He was kind enough to refer to me.

Mr. STEENERSON. Certainly.

Mr. LEWIS. Since that statement I have looked at the statement of the Postmaster General. With regard to the pound it is correct, but with regard to the piece the cost was found to be something less than 4 cents a piece, and the revenue a little over 5 cents a piece.

Mr. STEENERSON. I think, perhaps, that may be correct, but it is not in accordance with my recollection. However, that can be settled later on. It is undoubtedly true that the rate of 12 cents a pound would be compensatory. I think that the right view to take is that we should not, at least, view the matter of parcel post entirely from the standpoint of the proposed patron. I think that it is the duty of Congress to consider it from the point of view of the Government. If we do, I think we will all agree that no parcel-post rate should be fixed that would involve the Government in a loss.

The business of transportation of parcels, or package freight, is not one of the necessary functions of government, but belongs rather to that field which is usually occupied by private enterprise. No political philosopher has as yet been able to lay down any certain rule to define the boundaries between what may or may not be properly undertaken as a government activity to the exclusion of the citizen. There are theories enough, but in actual practice governments only enter the field of private enterprise when it becomes necessary to protect the public from injustice and extortion. If these can be avoided by strict government regulation, it is wise to do so.

Originally the postal service was simply a service carrying the Government dispatches—intelligence from one Government agency to another—and it gradually took on the carrying of letters for the public. The idea that it should become the transporter of merchandise is a modern idea. The postal service has grown up to satisfy the need for rapid and certain transmission of intelligence by means of letters and newspapers and periodicals. That being the main function, our transportation system has been adapted to it, and it is an expensive one.

I have already alluded to the fact that it has carried small loads on heavy cars; that it has carried them at great speed, at frequent intervals, by rail and by star route. Now, if this had been designed from the beginning as a means for transporting freight, it would have been planned a little differently than it is. And therefore we find that the laws governing compensation to the railway companies, which carry the most of our mail, are based upon an entirely different plan than would have been designed for a concern doing freight business.

The law in regard to compensation of railways for carrying mail is a growth that started 40 or 50 years ago when railroads were young. The railway mail pay is based upon the average number of pounds which passes over each mile of railroad during the year—the average weight per day per year. It is not a fixed rate. It is a sliding scale, varying according to the density of the traffic. A railroad that carries only 200 pounds of mail on an average each day is paid a rate 20 times higher per pound than one that carries over 50,000 pounds.

The compensation paid the railroads for transporting the mails is a certain amount per mile per annum, based on the average weight per day carried over the whole length of the mail route. The average weight is ascertained every four years by special weighings for that purpose, a weighing being had annually in one of the four districts into which the country is divided.

The schedule of rates was fixed by the act of March 3, 1873 (chap. 231, sec. 1, 17 Stat., 558). This was reduced 10 per cent in 1876 (act of July 12, 1876, chap. 179, 19 Stat., 78); and a reduction of 5 per cent was made in 1878 (act of June 17, 1878, chap. 259, 20 Stat., 140). The act of March 2, 1907 (chap. 2513, 34 Stat., 1212), provided for a decrease of rates on routes where the average weight per day was between 5,000 pounds and 48,000 pounds, and on those where it was over 48,000 pounds, respectively. The following was the schedule in force during 1908. It is still in force, save that by the act of May 12, 1910 (chap. 230, 36 Stat., 362), the compensation on land-grant railroads for each 2,000 pounds carried in excess of 48,000 pounds was reduced from \$17.10 to \$15.39.



## Schedule of rates for railway-mail transportation.

Average weight of mails per day carried over whole length of route.	Pay per mile per annum.			Intermediate weight warranting allowance of \$1 per mile under the law of 1873 and the custom of the department, subject to acts of July 12, 1876, June 17, 1878, and Mar. 2, 1907.
	Rates allowable under act of Mar. 3, 1873.	Rates allowable under acts of July 12, 1876, June 17, 1878, and Mar. 2, 1907.	Rates allowable to land-grant railroads under acts of July 12, 1876, June 17, 1878, and Mar. 2, 1907.	
200 pounds.....	\$50.00	\$42.75	\$34.20	Pounds.
200 to 500 pounds.....				12
500 pounds.....	75.00	64.12	51.30	
500 to 1,000 pounds.....				20
1,000 pounds.....	100.00	85.50	68.40	
1,000 to 1,500 pounds.....				20
1,500 pounds.....	125.00	103.87	85.50	
1,500 to 2,000 pounds.....				20
2,000 pounds.....	150.00	128.25	102.60	
2,000 to 3,500 pounds.....				60
3,500 pounds.....	175.00	149.62	119.70	
3,500 to 5,000 pounds.....				60
5,000 pounds.....	200.00	171.00	136.80	
5,000 to 48,000 pounds.....				80
For every additional 2,000 pounds over 5,000 pounds and under 48,000 pounds.....	25.00	20.30	16.24	
For every 2,000 pounds over 48,000 pounds.....	25.00	19.24	17.10	103.96 116.96

No. of route.	State and terminl.	Corporate title of company.	Length of route.	Average weight of mails carried over entire route, per day.	Miles per hour.	Average trips per week.	Pay per mile per annum for transportation.	Annual rate of pay for transportation.
131002	Pittsburgh, Pa., Chicago, Ill.	Pennsylvania Co.	408.43	211,644	34.64	74.68	\$2,180.61	\$1,021,463.14
133034	Rockport, Rockport Junction (n.o.)	(Chicago, Indiana & Southern R.R. Co.) (Southern Ry. Co.)	16.55	274	18.50	12.50	47.88	792.41

We have not been idle in this matter of reducing railway mail pay. The fact is that we have reduced the railway mail nearly one-third in the last six years. I made a computation some time ago. In 1900, out of the total disbursements in the service 31 car pay 21.4 per cent. That is, we decreased the railway-mail pay, if we based it upon the proportion of the total expenditures, about one-third in the 10 years. That is the reason we have per cent was for transportation by rail, and counting pay for railway post-office cars, it was 35 per cent. In 1910, out of total disbursements in the postal service we only spent 19 per cent for transportation by rail and counting railway post-office been able to increase the pay of rural and city carriers as well as other postal employees. If last year we had paid at the rate we did 10 years ago we would have paid over seventy millions to the railroads instead of fifty. If you are going into the business of competing with the express companies without loss to the Government you will have to change your system of railway-mail pay either upon the basis suggested by the Postmaster General or some other logical and scientific system that would fit the different classes of matter to be carried. Postage is a flat rate fixed according to one factor—weight—regardless of distance, while in paying for transportation of mail by railroads the Government bases it on two factors—weight and distance. If, for instance, your country route is 100 miles, you can carry 100,000 letters for about the same expense as a single letter, but you could not carry 100,000 sacks of potatoes at the cost of carrying 1. With good roads you might carry 40 or 50 sacks for about the same cost, but there the limit would be reached. In transportation of freight the element of distance becomes a more and more important factor as weight and bulk increase. The Postmaster General in his report proposes a plan. He says:

## READJUSTMENT OF RAILWAY MAIL PAY.

Another problem of great consequence to the postal service that should be acted on by Congress during the coming session is the compensation of the railways for carrying the mails. During the year the department completed the investigation begun early in the administration with the object of determining what it costs the railways to perform this service, and the report of the inquiry was submitted to Congress on the 12th of August last. The statistics obtained during the course of the investigation disclosed for the first time the cost of carrying mail in comparison with the revenue derived by the railways from this service. It appeared from these statistics that while many of the railways, and particularly the larger systems, made heavy profits from mail transportation, certain of the lines were actually carrying the

Mr. NYE. Have we any report from this commission, or either of these commissions that the gentleman has mentioned, as to whether or not the Government is on the whole paying too much for the transportation of mail by rail?

Mr. STEENERSON. No; we have not. The department has made computations.

Mr. NYE. We have been a long while trying to get it.

Mr. STEENERSON. It will be readily seen that it is a difficult question to arrive at, because of the kind of service that is rendered. You can not estimate it by the pound. It actually costs that railroad that carries only 200 pounds a day a good deal more than they get for it. It is a strange fact. They have gone before the department, these short-line railroads from Long Island and elsewhere, and they have established by undoubted evidence that they carried the mail at a loss, although they received a rate 20 times greater than the rate paid to a road that carried over 48,000 pounds in average daily weight over its route. Here are two sample routes taken from the report of the department, one with a dense traffic, and one with a light traffic, and we can see how it works out: Route No. 131002—Pittsburgh to Chicago, Pennsylvania Railroad—this route is 408.43 miles long and carries 211,644 pounds average daily weight, 74.68 trips per week, and receives the lowest rate of pay, and yet earns \$2,180.61 per mile per year, or a total of \$1,021,463.14. Route No. 133034—Rockport to Rockport Junction, Chicago, Indiana & Southern Railroad Co.—this route is 16.55 miles long and carries 274 pounds of mail daily, and makes an average of 12.50 trips per week. The average cost per mile per year is \$47.88, or a total of \$792.41. Less than a rural carrier would get for only six trips a week.

As a result of the inquiry the importance of making some change in the method of fixing railway mail pay became apparent, and the department, after giving the subject careful consideration, decided to urge the abandonment altogether of the present plan of fixing such compensation on the basis of the weight of the mails carried, a plan that has proved to be exceedingly expensive and in other respects unsatisfactory. In substitution for this method the department recommended a plan by which the compensation should be determined on the basis of the amount of space required in cars for the handling of the mails, making proper allowances, of course, for the extent and frequency of the service performed. The new plan, if authorized by Congress, will require the railway companies each year to report what it costs them to carry the mails, and such other information as will enable the department to determine the cost of mail transportation. This cost to be apportioned on the basis of the car space provided and frequency of service rendered, and payment to be allowed at the rate thus determined in amounts that will cover the cost and 6 per cent profit. Should a railway be dissatisfied with the manner in which the department apportions the cost in fixing compensation, it will have an opportunity, under the proposed plan, to appeal to the Interstate Commerce Commission. If Congress gives the recommendation of the department in this regard its favorable consideration and authorizes a readjustment of railway mail pay in the manner suggested, it is believed that the resulting saving to the Government will amount annually to about \$9,000,000.

He estimates his plan would save \$9,000,000 a year. I doubt if it would result in as great a saving as that, if we depend upon the railways to estimate the cost of doing the service. From what I have observed in the cases where railway rates have been litigated, both in Minnesota and in other States, there seems to be a great diversity of opinion about the cost of the service. The railroads in my State have been able to show that a rate is confiscatory which is perfectly profitable outside of the State in a neighboring territory, and I fear that if they leave it to the railroads to say how much the cost is they will outfigure us. [Laughter.] But the plan contemplates an appeal to the Interstate Commerce Commission, or some tribunal of that kind, to fix the cost, and then it ought to work out all right.

If the rates of the express companies of the United States had been regulated as they ought to have been regulated and as the railroad rates have been regulated, we would not have had this persistent demand for the Government taking over this species of freight transportation. The express companies have escaped regulation for some reason or other until very recently. We placed the express companies under the Interstate Commerce Commission a couple of years ago, and they have not yet had time to do anything. I understand they are consider-

ing that question and are about to issue an order in regard to express rates. I believe if that order is, as is usual with the orders of the Interstate Commerce Commission, based upon intelligent investigation and upon justice and right it will afford the people more real relief than the proposed new service.

Mr. WILLIS. Will the gentleman yield for a question?

Mr. STEENERSON. Certainly.

Mr. WILLIS. I want to ask the gentleman a question about the parcel post. On page 35 of the bill there is a paragraph about which I am anxious to have the gentleman's opinion. It says here:

That on each and all rural mail delivery routes of the United States the postmaster at the starting point of such route shall until June 30, 1914, receive and deliver to the carrier or carriers of said routes all articles, parcels, or packages not prohibited to the mails by law and falling under the definition of fourth-class matter and not weighing in excess of 11 pounds, for transportation and delivery on said routes only.

Further on it says:

And the carriers shall receive at intermediate points on all rural routes such mail matter of the fourth class for delivery on their respective routes only.

That is to say, this bill provides that there shall be this special rule of service if it originates at the distributing office or at any point on a route, but if I live on one route and I wish to send a package on another rural route it can not be done under this provision.

Mr. STEENERSON. No.

Mr. WILLIS. Why can not that be provided?

Mr. STEENERSON. They prepared this rural route parcel-post provision in that form, and I presume they wanted to confine it to one route. I could not go into the philosophy of it.

Mr. WILLIS. Does the gentleman see any objection now to extending it to all the routes starting at one point?

Mr. STEENERSON. My opinion on that would be of very little value, because I have not made a specialty of that feature of the bill. I think if the gentleman will inquire of the chairman of the committee, or of the gentleman from South Carolina [Mr. FINLEY], he will get more valuable opinions than he can get from me.

The Hughes commission have made one suggestion, which is that there could be a law providing that the Government should not pay any higher rate than the railroad companies give to the express companies or any other patrons. For instance, it has been stated at the hearings that from a point like New York City to a point like Buffalo, 400 or 500 miles, the rate on newspapers is 1 cent a pound, and under the rates charged by the railroad companies to the Government we lose 5 cents a pound.

Of course we ought to be glad to lose that, so that we can not complain if the express company competes and takes away some of that business. The express companies do take some of that business, because the railroad companies carry the newspapers for one-half cent a pound for that distance, whereas the railroad companies charge two or three times that much, on an average, for that distance to the Government. The Hughes commission made the suggestion that the law governing railway-mail pay might be so amended as to require that in no case should the rates allowed by the Postmaster General exceed the rates which the railroad company itself voluntarily grants to express companies or other patrons of the road, and it seems to me that might be a very valuable suggestion.

The Government now has a monopoly in carrying all letters, or first-class mail, and no one can engage in it; but certainly it would seem to me that the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MADSEN] is correct in saying that we ought not to assert a monopoly of the package-freight business unless we can do it at a reasonable price. If we should assert a monopoly and charge \$240 a ton for it, that would destroy commerce and do more damage than we have ever done good by the postal service. It is absolutely ridiculous.

Now, Mr. Chairman, there is another matter that I noticed in the speech of the chairman of the committee, and I want to refer to it. I had the honor to serve in the Fifty-eighth, Fifty-ninth, and Sixtieth Congresses on this committee with the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. MOON], and also in the present Congress, and I cheerfully and heartily testify to his faithfulness in the service of the people. I find in the speech which he made the following remarks:

The Democracy has ever stood against the wicked policy of the Republican Party in attempting to subsidize railroads and ship companies. It gave to me—if I may be pardoned for mentioning it—the signal honor of leading the party in the House in the four great contests upon these questions, in which we were victorious notwithstanding the overwhelming Republican majorities in the House, perhaps the only instances in the last 14 years where the Republican Party was defeated on measures demanded and supported in the national platform. Thus the Treasury was saved \$40,000,000.

Now, of course, having served with him on the committee, and being one of the men who opposed the railway subsidy and ship subsidies, I think I am entitled to share in the credit. He says that the Treasury was saved \$40,000,000. I think the gentleman will certainly concede to the Republicans on the committee that stood by him a share of the honor of defeating the subsidies. In my humble way I think I was the first man to make an attack on the Southern Railway subsidy in the committee. Of course, the chairman was then the leader of the minority party in the committee. I made the fight so far as the Republican side was concerned. When the ship-subsidy fight came on, the Republicans on the committee were divided. The gentleman from Kansas [Mr. MURDOCK] and the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. STAFFORD]—not now here, but who was an able and conscientious Representative—stood by me most manfully. But what I object to in the statement is that he says that the legislation was demanded in the national Republican platform. That would make me out a sort of recalcitrant. I think that is what the ship-subsidy men called me. They had a magazine which they published, and said that I was a "recalcitrant Republican" because I did not support the ship subsidy. I will insert in my speech the planks of the Republican platforms of 1904 and 1908, and I think I can convince the gentleman that the Republican platform never did declare for a railroad subsidy nor a ship subsidy, and therefore I was not a recalcitrant Republican but a loyal Republican in standing up with the gentleman from Tennessee on that proposition.

From 1904 national Republican platform:

We favor legislation which will encourage and build up the American merchant marine.

From 1908 national Republican platform:

We urge such legislation as will advance the merchant-marine prestige of the country, so essential to the national defense, the enlargement of avenues of trade, and the industrial prosperity of our own people.

My recollection is that there were more Democrats in the Fifty-eighth and Fifty-ninth Congresses who voted for railway subsidies than Republicans; at least a majority of the Democrats, if I recollect right, voted for it, and it was not until the Fifty-ninth Congress that we got rid of that in the Post Office appropriation bill.

I congratulate the gentleman from Tennessee on his splendid record in this matter, but I say that the Republicans who stood by him, both in committee and on the floor of the House, are entitled to share in the honor, and that it is not fair to say that they were opposing the principles of the Republican platform, because all the Republican platform ever said on the subject of subsidies was that it was in favor of laws to encourage the merchant marine, which was all right; they did not say that it should be done in any particular manner. We have done well to preserve the postal revenues for the postal business instead of using them for any such wild enterprise as that.

Now, Mr. Chairman, I want to discuss another matter very briefly for a few moments, which I think will interest my friends on the other side of the House.

On the 11th day of February last year, while the agricultural appropriation bill was under consideration, it was my privilege to submit a few remarks in relation to the then pending Canadian reciprocity bill, and I believe it was the first speech delivered on that subject in the House. As it turned out it was fortunate I did so, because the bill was reported under a rule which excluded general debate.

When the present Congress was called into extra session a year ago, the Democratic Party, then in control of the House, adopted the very same tactics and forced the same measure through under a rule without amendment or free debate. They admitted that it would be unfair to compel the farmers to sell their products in a free-trade market while they had to buy in a highly protected market, but they said they proposed to remedy that by a radical reduction of the tariff downward, with the accent on the D, reducing it to a strictly revenue basis. When it was suggested that it would be safer to amend the reciprocity bill by attaching to it a general revision bill of at least the more important schedules such as wool, cotton, steel, and chemicals, they refused to do so, and proceeded to pass these bills separately, although they knew they had no chance of presidential approval.

So the reciprocity bill became a law, so far as we could make it a law, and it remains a standing offer on our part, and will take effect whenever Canada shall accept it by enacting reciprocal legislation. It is true that at the election held in Canada on the 21st of September last the parliamentary party responsible for the agreement was defeated, partly on that issue, but there is an indication that the Canadians may change their minds upon that subject and accept our offer, which they may



do at any time as long as our statute remains unrepealed. On the first day of the present session I introduced a bill to repeal the reciprocity law. It was referred to the Committee on Ways and Means, where it has slumbered peacefully ever since. Only last week I asked the chairman of the Committee on Ways and Means why his committee would not now take up my bill and report it to the House, and he replied that they expected Canada to change her mind and accept it. I take it that he has reason for that expectation. The same belief has been expressed in other quarters. This will be shown from the extract from the newspaper which I will herewith insert:

INSISTS ON FREE-TRADE "RECIPROCITY."

It is said that President Taft is displeased at the action of the Senate Committee on Finance in reporting favorably the bill repealing (with the exception of section 2, the free paper and pulp section) the Canadian agreement law of July 26, 1911. He wants the law to stand as it is, in the hope that Canada will change her mind and vote to ratify the agreement. The New York Herald's Washington correspondence of March 31 has the following:

"President Taft frequently has expressed his desire that despite the election of the antireciprocity party in Canada last September the act should remain on the statutes. He believes that ultimately the Canadian people will see the benefits of reciprocity and accept the American offer. Sir Wilfrid Laurier, formerly Prime Minister and still leader of the liberal party, believes that reciprocity will ultimately be accepted in Canada if the American offer is left standing.

"The Borden government, which came into power after a bitter and anti-American campaign, would be glad to see the offer withdrawn, the Canadian West feeling that it lost a great opportunity for an improved market for its grain through the rejection of reciprocity. While it is scarcely to be expected that the Borden government, elected as it was by the united support of the protected interests and on an antireciprocity platform, will voluntarily turn to the standing offer, the outlook for the ultimate success of the policy is better than its friends had hoped. A dispatch from Ottawa to the Herald says that the Borden government, should it desire reciprocity, would seek to negotiate a new agreement rather than accept the one negotiated last year."

It is perfectly reasonable, therefore, to say that there is a probability that unless the act is repealed it may go into effect in the near future.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. WEEKS. Mr. Chairman, I yield 10 minutes more to the gentleman from Minnesota.

Mr. STEENERSON. Mr. Chairman, there is a deadlock, so that we have this situation: If the Canadians accept our offer that law will go into effect, but the farmer will get no compensation. It was argued here on the floor of this House that they were going to pass a free-list bill to compensate the farmer for his loss, and other tariff bills to compensate him for his loss. But he gets nothing because of the deadlock. The Tariff Board has reported, and it shows conclusively that both the wool and the cotton schedules are entirely too high, and, in the language of the President, indefensible, and yet no relief is promised. I could go into the specific items in that report to show how unreasonably high some of the rates are, and how the wool duties are so arranged that the manufacturer is, by the system of compensatory duties, compensated for what he does not pay, while the woolgrower is cheated out of the protection he is supposed to get. But I have not the time here.

Mr. Chairman, why should the farmer be subject to this danger of Canadian free trade while all other producers of the country are to continue to enjoy the advantage of extremely high duties? The Democratic leaders admitted when they proposed the farmers' free-list bill that they ought to compensate the farmers for the loss by reason of Canadian reciprocity, but they are now willing to take away or refuse that compensation. The situation will be that the manufacturers, shielded by a friendly veto, will continue to enjoy excessive duties, while the farmer, if the Canadian reciprocity is accepted, will have free trade. He will be not the beneficiary, but the victim of tariff revision.

We all know why the Democrats passed the Canadian reciprocity bill. It was not because they liked it. They recognized full well that it was a one-sided affair, that the duties were so arranged as to sacrifice the farmers for the benefit of the manufacturers, and their benefit only. They passed that bill because they were under obligation to the President to do so. The President would not have called them into extra session and given them the opportunity that an extra session yielded unless he had understood that they were going to pass the Canadian reciprocity bill. They performed their share of the arrangement, whether it was a tacit or an express agreement. They passed that bill, because the President would not have called them together unless they had in some way convinced him they would do so. The Canadian people were given an opportunity to vote upon that proposition, and they voted against it. They refused to accept it. Is there any obligation on the part of the Democratic Party to continue that law now? I say none. I say, as I said to the chairman, they ought to report a repeal bill, because they have done their duty as the President expected

them to do it. They have given the consideration that he expected when they passed the bill, and, in order to prevent an injustice to the farmer resulting, they ought now to repeal the law. They may think that it is politically unwise to do so, but they certainly can not afford to go before the people and defend that kind of reciprocity. Are they going into this coming election and say that it is right to sacrifice the farmer's home market in favor of the automobile manufacturer? Are they going to say that it is right to put a duty of one dollar and a quarter a hundred on dressed meat or \$10 on an 800-pound steer when they give him the steer free from Canada?

The conversion charge, of which you have heard so much in tariff discussion, is in that case less than a dollar, and you give a duty of \$10, 1,000 per cent more than the total cost of production. Are you going to defend that in the next election? Then why not repeal it? There is no object in keeping it on the statute books, because if you are successful in the next campaign you certainly ought to be able to enact a more fair and a more just law than that. I say to the Democrats that you will gain nothing by refusing to repeal this law, and you are under no obligation to refuse to do so, but you are under obligation to repeal it because the tariff legislation that you have passed through this House will be deadlocked and will be ineffectual to save the farmer, and therefore the farmer is entitled to stand in the same place he stood before you started this latest tariff-revision program. If you do not do that you will readily see you are putting the farmers and not the President in a hole, because you have not given to the farmers that which they ought to have if they are going to bear these burdens which they are likely to do in case the Canadians change their minds. I therefore submit to the judgment of the majority of this House that they ought to report favorably the bill to repeal the Canadian reciprocity and let us go over to where we were before we started this proposed revision. We should not revise on the farmer until everybody else has also been revised. You should not let these people who are interested in Canadian reciprocity eat at the first table and let the farmer wait until the last table. You should serve them at the same table equally. [Applause.]

Mr. WEEKS. Mr. Chairman, I yield two minutes to the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. MURDOCK].

Mr. MURDOCK. Mr. Chairman, in the spring of 1910 a gentleman, Nathan B. Williams, of Fayetteville, Ark., wrote me a letter pointing out the fact that the Government of the United States does not assert its monopoly in the carriage of second, third, and fourth class mail matter. Shortly after receiving that letter I informed myself on the subject and introduced a resolution in this House dealing exhaustively with the matter. Out of this there has grown up a discussion throughout the country, in this body and in the Senate, over the Government's right to exercise a monopoly in the carriage of the mails. I understand that the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MADDEN], in his speech here this afternoon, insisted that it was not possible to assert that monopoly. Unfortunately, I did not hear him. I regret it, and I am taking that view of his speech from the remarks of the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. STEENERSON] who has just taken his seat.

I am one of those who do not believe that any governmental control over postage rates can be wholly effective until the Government asserts its monopoly in the carriage of mail matter. As I have pointed out for the last two years in these debates, if the Government has a flat, country-wide, inflexible rate the express companies, as competitors, will take over the short-haul business, which is remunerative, and leave the long-haul business, which is not remunerative, to the Government.

In order to throw some light on the power of the express companies to compete with the Government in the carriage of parcels I desire to make a short comparison between the rates provided in the proposed change in fourth-class rates in the pending bill and the rate charged by the American Express Co. to the postmaster general of Great Britain for the delivery of packages in the United States.

This contract was made between the American Express Co. and Great Britain in 1902, and a copy of it is on file with the Interstate Commerce Commission.

The rates under the present proposed reduction of the fourth-class postage rate from 16 cents to 12 cents a pound and the raising of the mailable weight from 4 pounds to 11 pounds may be stated as follows, for the purpose of comparison with the British-American Express Co. rates:

PROPOSED CHANGE IN FOURTH-CLASS RATE.	
Parcels weighing 1 to 3 pounds.	
	Cents.
1 pound.....	12
2 pounds.....	24
3 pounds.....	36
Express rate for British Government.....	36

Parcels weighing 3 to 7 pounds.		Cents.
4 pounds	-----	48
5 pounds	-----	60
6 pounds	-----	72
7 pounds	-----	84
Express rate for British Government	-----	48
Parcels weighing 7 to 11 pounds.		Cents.
8 pounds	-----	\$0. 96
9 pounds	-----	1. 08
10 pounds	-----	1. 20
11 pounds	-----	1. 32
Express rate for British Government	-----	. 60

## EXPRESS RATES FOR BRITISH PARCELS.

To any place in New York, Brooklyn, Jersey City, or Hoboken—

	Cents.
Where the weight of the parcel does not exceed 3 pounds	12
Where the weight of the parcel exceeds 3 pounds, but does not exceed 7 pounds	24
Where the weight of the parcel exceeds 7 pounds, but does not exceed 11 pounds	36

To any place in the mainland territory of the United States not situate in New York, Brooklyn, Jersey City, or Hoboken—

	Cents.
Where the weight of the parcel does not exceed 3 pounds	36
Where the weight of the parcel exceeds 3 pounds, but does not exceed 7 pounds	48
Where the weight of the parcel exceeds 7 pounds, but does not exceed 11 pounds	60

A cursory glance at these figures will show that if the provision in the present post-office supply bill should become law the American Express Co. would not find a very serious competitor in the Government in the business of carrying parcels. And this is not saying that the American Express Co. will deliver an 11-pound package for the American citizen for 60 cents, as it does for the British post office, in case this bill becomes law. It rather means that the express company will charge \$1 or \$1.25 for the delivery of an 11-pound parcel for the longer distances, for the express companies will continue to cut just under the Government's merchandise postage rates, in order to take most of the business away from the Government and yet maintain the highest possible profit while doing it.

The express companies were driven out of the field of competition in the carriage of first-class mail in 1844. Until they were driven out the Government was helpless in its handling of first-class mail. Since then the Government has been supreme in that field. But in the meantime the express companies have waxed fat in the profits of the mailable parcel business, however, and if the rates given to the British Government for the delivery of parcels in America by the American Express Co. are illuminating at all, they certainly reveal that a new governmental 12 cents a pound rate will not disturb them. They should be driven from our field; then we can advance in this matter with some certainty. I append that part of the contract between the British Government and the American Express Co. which pertains to rates, that its exact terms may be known:

I. In respect of the services performed by the company under this agreement there shall be payable by the postmaster general to the company the following sums (that is to say):

- A. In respect of conveyance—
  - (1) There shall be payable on every American parcel addressed to a place in New York, Brooklyn, Jersey City, or Hoboken—
    - Where the weight of the parcel does not exceed 3 pounds, 6d.
    - Where the weight of the parcel exceeds 3 pounds, but does not exceed 7 pounds, 1s.
    - Where the weight of the parcel exceeds 7 pounds, but does not exceed 11 pounds, 1s. 6d.
  - (2) There shall be payable on every American parcel addressed to any place in the mainland territory of the United States not situate in New York, Brooklyn, Jersey City, or Hoboken—
    - Where the weight of the parcel does not exceed 3 pounds, 1s. 6d.
    - Where the weight of the parcel exceeds 3 pounds, but does not exceed 7 pounds, 2s.
    - Where the weight of the parcel exceeds 7 pounds, but does not exceed 11 pounds, 2s. 6d.

## MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES.

The committee informally rose; and Mr. CULLOR having taken the chair as Speaker pro tempore, a message in writing from the President of the United States was communicated to the House of Representatives by Mr. Latta, one of his secretaries, who also informed the House of Representatives that the President had approved and signed bills of the following titles:

On April 3, 1912:

H. R. 22772. An act appropriating \$350,000 for the purposes of maintaining and protecting against impending floods the levees on the Mississippi River.

H. J. Res. 263. Joint resolution to authorize allotments to Indians of the Fort Berthold Indian Reservation, N. Dak., of lands valuable for coal.

On April 5, 1912:

H. J. Res. 232. Joint resolution extending the operation of the act for the control and regulation of the waters of Niagara

River for the preservation of Niagara Falls, and for other purposes.

On April 8, 1912:

H. R. 15471. An act making appropriation for repair, preservation, and exhibition of the trophy flags now in store in the Naval Academy, Annapolis, Md.

On April 9, 1912:

H. R. 20842. An act to provide for a tax upon white phosphorus matches, and for other purposes.

On April 12, 1912:

H. R. 14918. An act granting pensions and increase of pensions to certain soldiers and sailors of the Regular Army and Navy, and certain soldiers and sailors of wars other than the Civil War, and to widows of such soldiers and sailors.

## POST OFFICE APPROPRIATION BILL.

The committee resumed its session.

Mr. WEEKS. Mr. Chairman, I yield five minutes to the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. CATLIN].

Mr. CATLIN. Mr. Chairman, after protracted and persistent agitation covering a period of many years, the question is now directly presented to the House of passing upon the advisability of establishing or experimenting with, though in a limited way, a parcel post in this country.

The demand for this extension in our postal system has arisen primarily because of a general feeling on the part of the people that they should be relieved from the burden of having to pay unfair and exorbitant express rates in the shipment of their small packages. I share with others in this view and in the belief that something should be done to remedy this hardship and prevent the inconveniences of the people from being sacrificed for the continuing riches and aggrandizement of the express companies; however, I do not believe that the remedy for this is through the establishment of a parcels post, but rather that the obstacle is to be overcome by governmental regulation of express rates themselves, as in the case of railroad rates, through the decrees of the Interstate Commerce Commission, whose power has already been extended to such matter by the action of a former Congress.

In its report the committee admits the necessity for conservative legislation on this subject and that some definite information should be gathered and obtained through commission investigation before any general and unlimited law should be established, but it proposes, in the bill presented, for the Government to first experiment in a limited way with a parcels post by providing for such a system on each of the rural routes for a period of two years, the postage rate to be 5 cents per pound for the first pound and 2 cents per pound over 1 pound and for fractions of a pound, up to 11 pounds' limit, on the theory that, if such a scheme shall prove unwise, it can be repealed or expire by limitation at the end of that time.

I object to the idea of experimenting at all, even in a limited way, in this important matter until after a careful investigation, just as I believe it is best to have accurate facts and information about the tariff schedules from a Tariff Board in order to properly fix the duties. Besides, such a limited parcels post on the rural routes will not be a fair test or experiment as to probable effects of a universal system, and while it will doubtless not prove as harmful as an unlimited one covering the entire country, still it is objectionable in that it would in the end probably be an entering wedge for a general parcels post, and for that reason I am not in favor of it.

It does not follow because parcels post has worked to advantage in England, Germany, and other European countries that it would be equally beneficial and profitable in the United States, where conditions as to area of square miles, number of people, and density of population are quite different. The parcels post of England serves a population of about 42,000,000 of thickly settled people within an area of about 120,000 square miles, whereas we have a population of about 90,000,000, sparsely settled, and in an area of three and one-half millions or more square miles; or, in other words, thirty times more area to cover and only about twice the population, all of which will necessarily make a difference in the expense of carrying merchandise.

I can not divorce myself from the conviction and argument that a domestic parcels post will drive out of business the country merchant and retailer, and have an injurious effect upon the rural towns and communities by decreasing property values and by tending to deplete them through a drift of their population to the larger cities, where business will necessarily become concentrated. Already this overcrowding of the cities is one of the causes of our present high cost of living, a condition rather to be avoided than further encouraged, and so appeal is



constantly being made for the people to again go back to the smaller towns and farms. Moreover, the trade of the jobbing houses will be materially injured, if not destroyed, and the traveling men displaced by catalogues. In short, the commercial system of the country will be completely revolutionized by substituting mail-order houses and cash payments for the credit system now existing and so important a factor in the development and building of new communities, and which many feel, as I do, is still much needed. [Applause.]

Mr. WEEKS. Mr. Chairman, I yield to the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. DYER].

Mr. DYER. Mr. Chairman, there are many features in this bill that I highly commend and which will have a tendency to work for the betterment and improvement of the service. It is not my intention at this time to enter into a discussion of the bill in general and to point out the improvements provided for in this bill for the clerks, carriers, railway mail clerks, and so forth. When the bill is read under the five-minute rule I hope to speak on these matters in detail and suggest still further changes in the present law, and probably offer some amendments to certain provisions of this bill, which, in my judgment, are needed to increase the pay in certain instances, provide for 30 days' annual leave for all the employees of the Post Office Department, as well as benefit the men by improving the conditions and facilities under which they have to work. At this time I rise specially to enter my opposition against section 8 of this bill, which section has to do with the establishment of a parcel post. I do not believe that the country is ready or prepared for the enactment into a law of that portion of this bill. I am one of those who believe that before entering upon so great a project, untried and new to this country, that a careful investigation should first be had as to the probable effect the establishment of a parcel post will have to the whole country, including its various industries and its people generally. This bill, so far as it refers to the establishment of a parcel-post law, is said to be for the special benefit of farmers. It is not claimed that it is to benefit any other class of people, but only those living upon rural free delivery routes. While I am heartily in favor of enacting legislation that will be of benefit to the farmers, I can not see my duty clear to vote for a law that will be harmful to the great commercial and retail interests of our country. Many thousands of men are employed in these industries, and I would be recreant to my duty as a Member of Congress should I favor the establishment of a parcel post, when, in my judgment, it would do irreparable damage to the great manufacturing and commercial houses, jobbers, and other industries, the success of which must and does mean the happiness and prosperity of so many people who obtain their livelihood in the employment therein and have their homes in the great cities and industrial centers of this country. The farmers, as a class, are as prosperous to-day as any people in our country, and we should turn our attention to the prosperity of millions of our people who do not earn their livelihood from the farm, and it is especially in the interests of that part of our great American people that I enter my protest against the parcel-post feature of the bill now under consideration.

I have here a number of protests from representative citizens, commercial and individual interests, in my district who are opposed to the parcel-post feature of this bill. I desire to call the attention of the committee to these protests, with the hope that it will aid in the elimination of that section of this bill. I desire, Mr. Chairman, that I may have permission to insert in the RECORD the letters referred to for the information of the House.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Missouri [Mr. DYER] asks unanimous consent to extend his remarks in the RECORD in the manner indicated. Is there objection? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none.

The letters are as follows:

SIMMONS HARDWARE CO.,  
St. Louis, U. S. A., March 9, 1912.

Hon. L. C. DYER,  
House of Representatives, Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: In reply to yours of the 6th instant. We are very glad to have an opportunity to express our opinion on the subject of the proposed parcel-post appropriation (H. R. 21279), section 8.

In considering this matter we have endeavored to eliminate any selfish business reasons that we may have against the passage of a general parcel post and to look at it solely from the broad view as to what is best for the country. If you will investigate, I think you will find that the equipment and facilities of the rural free delivery are such that it would be unable to handle either promptly or economically the great amount of business which would be thrust upon it by the passage of a general parcel-post bill, thus merely adding to the deficit of the Post Office Department instead of assisting in any way. It is an old business principle never to undertake extended business without first being ready for it in the way of handling facilities.

The principal objection would be the almost inevitable result of putting out of business the retail dealer in the small towns, because by means of a general parcel post the catalogue or mail-order houses in the large cities would be enabled to undersell the customers of this

retailer on all the rural free-delivery routes. For instance, a retailer situated, say, in Kansas buys the bulk of his goods from the jobbing trade, and in one shape or another pays the freight on such goods from the manufacturer to his own town, while the catalogue or mail-order house in Chicago would find a large portion of this transportation charge absorbed by a general parcel post. You will readily see that under a general parcel post any transportation of articles, save for a very short distance, would inevitably prove exceedingly expensive; in fact, they would cost more than they would bring in the way of revenue, because of the flat rate which is apportioned without any regard as to distance. It is quite a serious question as to whether the consumer would, in the long run, obtain his goods any cheaper by patronizing the catalogue or mail-order house direct than by the present plan of dealing with the nearest town or city. It seems to use a very heavy price to pay for such possible reduction by the elimination of one of the most valuable types of citizens and the drying up the small town, which is fast becoming the center of life and activity for all the neighboring farming community. Not only does the retailer now supply the farmers in his vicinity with all their wants, but he likewise takes their farm produce in exchange for his goods, gives them credit when they need it, and none of these things would be possible on the centralized plan where the farmer would deal with a large distributing house at a great distance.

We know from experience that the natural tendency in the way of distribution is from the wholesaler to the retailer and from the retailer to the consumer, thus utilizing a large number of small distributing centers which are scattered throughout the country, and these centers are constantly growing and multiplying. They enable both the retailer and the consumer to get his goods quickly as he needs them and when he needs them, and so far this method seems to have proved both efficient and economical. We are quite convinced from over half a century of experience that it is the natural way and will continue, unless it be overthrown by some arbitrary and artificial method such as a general parcel post, where the Government at great risk and with much uncertainty undertakes to inaugurate a system not at all suited either to the needs or conditions of this country. I am aware that the present plan contemplates a certain zone of delivery originating with the headquarters of each rural free delivery, but the general feeling is that this is a mere entering wedge to a general parcel post, and is designed to get the cooperation and to quiet the fears of the retailer by apparently putting him in a favorable position, when really the end aimed at is a system which will be finally his destruction.

Secondly, the argument is used that we have the parcel post in foreign countries, and also have parcel post according to the international agreement between foreign countries and this country, therefore why not extend the international parcel-post agreement all over the country? In reply to this we would say, first, because we made a great mistake when we entered into such an agreement with foreign countries; two wrongs do not make a right. In the second place, parcel post in this country is not comparable with parcel post in foreign countries. In Great Britain they have a population of 372 to the square mile; in Germany, 290; in France, 189; in Belgium, 655; while in the United States we have 30 inhabitants to the square mile. Twenty-six of our States are each larger than England. In England the longest air-line haul is 700 miles; in Germany, 850; France, 650; Belgium, 190; as opposed to 2,000 miles in the United States. In these foreign countries the railroads are either owned outright or operated under subsidies given by the Government. So you see the two situations can not be compared.

It seems to us the intelligent thing to do would be to appoint a commission to study this question thoroughly, not only in this country, but in foreign countries. We feel sure that when this commission investigates the rural population and the mercantile growth of foreign countries as compared to this they will not advocate parcel post.

Yours, truly,

A. W. DOUGLAS, Vice President.

GEO. F. DITTMANN BOOT & SHOE CO.,  
St. Louis, U. S. A., March 9, 1912.

Hon. L. C. DYER,  
House of Representatives, Washington.

DEAR SIR: We want to thank you for the printed copy of the post office appropriation bill and for the report accompanying it.

We are active working members of the American League of Associations, the Western Association of Shoe Wholesalers, and the St. Louis Sales Managers' Association, all of which have voiced their opinion and given most emphatic and substantial reasons why the United States is not ready to adopt a parcel-post system of any nature, and we take this occasion to reiterate the sentiments that have been conveyed to the House committee by these associations, which represent some of the largest manufacturers and distributors in the United States.

Yours, truly,

PHIL A. BECKER, Secretary.

THE BROWN SHOE CO., OF ST. LOUIS,  
March 9, 1912.

Hon. L. C. DYER,  
House of Representatives, Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR CONGRESSMAN: We understand the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads of the House of Representatives contemplate reporting a bill providing for an extension of the international parcel-post agreement, as well as experimental local rural parcel post, together with a commission to investigate the subject.

We are firmly of the opinion that once a parcel-post law is written on the statute books the provision for a commission to investigate the subject will be of little or no avail.

We therefore urge upon you to use your influence, as well as power, looking toward the appointment of an impartial commission, and that no legislation be attempted until such a commission shall have made a thorough investigation and reported its findings, and the writer would appreciate a line from you in said connection.

Very sincerely,

THE BROWN SHOE CO.,  
G. W. BROWN, President.

PETERS SHOE CO.,  
St. Louis, March 12, 1912.

Hon. L. C. DYER, M. C.,  
House of Representatives, Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: We appreciate your inquiry of March 7 and thank you for your courtesy in sending us the copy of House bill No. 21279 with the committee report on same. In reply will say that we believe that portion of the bill providing for the extension of parcel post to cover rural

routes should be defeated. If a commission is to be appointed to investigate the result of the workings of parcel post in Europe, the commission should be permitted to make its report before parcel post is extended. This goes without saying. We are opposed to all parcel post whether the limit in weight be 4 pounds, 11 pounds, or 100 pounds for the reason that we do not consider the moving of merchandise as a proper function of the postal department. The Government has control over the railroads and the express companies and should exercise that control, but do not see that the postal department has any more business carrying freight than the Department of Agriculture has to sell potatoes at less than cost to break a high potato market. The mere fact that the carrying of letters, which is the proper function of the postal department, yields that department a profit is no sound argument for the establishment of a freight-traffic department by the Post Office Department or the turning of the postal department into a common carrier.

The only possible argument there can be for the establishment of a general parcel post is that it may facilitate the buying of goods by people in local communities from the mail-order houses or department stores. The effect that this has had in Europe is to practically eliminate the country town and make of it merely a "wide place in the road." The country merchant is not a merchant in Europe, but merely a storekeeper. We do not believe that any good American wants to see European conditions established in America. Investigation by a properly qualified commission will show that the European method of distribution does not result in a saving to the consumer, but merely inconveniences him in forcing him to wait for a mail-order shipment from the big distributing city. We do not believe that a parcel-post law will force the country merchant out of business, but it will naturally take away from him much of his trade in what may be termed the "luxuries," the profit on which to-day makes up for no profit on many of the staples, such as sugar and other articles that are bought by the people in large quantities. If the trade in the luxuries is removed, the country merchant must charge more for his staples. Statistics will show that the retail merchant is just about making both ends meet at the present time, hence a loss of his profit on luxuries will, as above stated, have to be made up by higher prices to the consumer on the staples.

We favor the commission plan because we are confident it will show the weakness of the European system of distribution and demonstrate that in this particular, as in practically all others, the United States is head and shoulders above the other nations of the world.

Yours, truly,

PETERS BRANCH OF INTERNATIONAL SHOE CO.  
OSBORNE.

FRIEDMAN-SHELBY SHOE CO.,  
St. Louis, March 12, 1912.

Hon. L. C. DYER,  
House of Representatives, Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR SIR: Your favor of the 6th instant, also copy of the Post Office appropriation bill (H. R. 21279) and report accompanying same, duly received.

We realize that as interested parties our position in the matter might be misunderstood, but we sincerely believe that the supposed benefits to be derived from this measure will be far offset by the undesirable consequences bound to follow. Of course, you know about "the back-to-the-country" movement. The tendency of the times is for the people to leave the farm and small country towns and go to the cities. Magazines and the daily press are advocating "parcel post," and this measure, while supposedly in the interest of the farmer, bringing delivery to his door, really acts as a destroyer of life in the small country town. It will almost annihilate the small country merchant, and in consequence mitigate against the prosperity of the small country towns. Conditions in this country are not the same as they are in Europe. Many city papers are probably advocating this measure because they want the advertising from the large department stores, who are fast becoming mail-order houses and would utilize "parcel post" to drive out of business the small country merchants. It will deteriorate our manufactures, because goods sold from pictures, as they must be if sold from catalogue and delivered through "parcel post," will not possess the merit that goods must have if bought where the buyer has the right to investigate the merchandise before purchasing the same; in buying from mail-order houses he must send his money in advance. He has no chance to see the goods. This act will concentrate business in the hands of the few—the large mail-order houses and department stores—and you can readily understand what the final outcome would be, which, we believe, is contrary to the spirit of our people, for we want to save the small or middle man.

You are probably aware of the different arguments advanced against "parcel post" by the American League of Associations at Chicago, as well as by Mr. S. Norvell, of this city, and many others, and we respectfully call your attention to same, as they cover the ground most fully. We believe practically all the wholesale houses in St. Louis, as well as manufacturers and retailers, are a unit in opposition to this measure.

Respectfully,

FRIEDMAN-SHELBY SHOE CO.,  
By WILLIAM D'OENCH.

ROBERTS, JOHNSON & RAND SHOE CO.,  
St. Louis, Mo., March 14, 1912.

Hon. L. C. DYER, M. C.,  
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: As requested by you in your favor of March 6, we have read the section of House bill 21279 referring to parcel post and the report of the committee thereon.

In our opinion the passage of this bill will destroy the business of small towns and the small merchants. It will centralize the business in large cities and put it in the power of a few great corporations to practically control the business of the country as a whole. Every consumer should be interested in his immediate community. If he is a farmer, his hands will enhance in value in comparison with the growth of his nearest town. Statistics on land values all over America absolutely demonstrate this fact, and we are quite sure that the decline in the value of real estate brought about by the centralization of business in large centers will more than offset any gain in the price of merchandise that might result from the ability of the small communities to market in the large centers.

If the bill could be so drawn as to absolutely prohibit any article being accepted by rural mail delivery that did not originate at the starting point of the route and from actual dealers, and not from agents representing large establishments, who might establish agents

to distribute merchandise that would be sent by freight to the various points where rural mail routes start from, if this bill could be so safeguarded, we could see no special objection to the bill. As far as this company is concerned, we are indifferent as to what is done. If it became necessary, we could no doubt distribute our merchandise to the consumer at a better profit than we are now doing to the retailer and at some saving to the consumer.

We are very much of the opinion, however, that the passage of this bill would be a detriment to the country as a whole. Anyone who has ever traveled through Europe can see clearly the effects of the parcel-post bill. Small towns have little or no general mercantile business, the consumers depending almost entirely on the large centers for their supplies, and we are sure that the passage of this measure will have the same results in this country.

Yours, very truly,

J. JOHNSON.

WERTHEIMER-SWARTS SHOE CO.,  
St. Louis, U. S. A., March 14, 1912.

Hon. L. C. DYER,  
House of Representatives, Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: We have yours of the 6th, in which you ask our opinion regarding bill H. R. 21279 and report accompanying same.

From the knowledge we have through newspaper publicity regarding parcel post we are very much opposed to it, and hope that you see the matter in the same light as we do, and endeavor your utmost to keep it from becoming a law. To us it appears it would mean a general upsetting of the whole country again and the gathering by a few large department stores in the metropolitan cities the entire retail business of the country, which is in itself a detriment to all interests—only another form of trusts.

The centralizing of the retail business in the hands of a few mail-order houses and department stores will throw millions of people out of work and reduce values of farm lands and products.

We sincerely trust that the bill will not pass.

Yours, very truly,

WERTHEIMER-SWARTS SHOE CO.,  
G. W. MILIUS.

MOUND CITY PAINT & COLOR CO.,  
St. Louis, March 14, 1912.

Hon. L. C. DYER,  
House of Representatives, Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: Replying to your favor of March 7 inquiring as to our judgment on that part of the Post Office appropriation bill which refers to the parcel post, would say that we thank you for your inquiry and the opportunity thus given us to express our opinion.

Without going into the arguments pro and con, which, as you know, have been pretty well argued, would say that we are against parcel post and would be glad to see our Representatives vote against that part of the bill when it comes up.

Again thanking you for your letter, I am,

Yours, very truly,

WM. H. GREGG, Jr.

NATIONAL CANDY CO.,  
St. Louis, Mo., March 13, 1912.

Hon. L. C. DYER,  
House of Representatives, Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: I am very grateful to you for your kind letter of the 7th in regard to H. R. 21279, and we are, as are many other large business concerns, seriously opposed to parcel post.

Section 8 I can not help but feel is simply a move in the direction of gradually establishing a general and permanent parcel post, which establishment, in my judgment, would be a very serious matter for business in general and would reflect only benefit to those businesses which are in a position to handle their affairs through the parcel post, as, for example, the mail-order houses.

Yours, very truly,

V. L. PRICE, Chairman.

THE BROWN SHOE CO.,  
St. Louis, U. S. A., March 16, 1912.

Hon. L. C. DYER,  
House of Representatives, Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: Please oppose any legislation for the extension of parcel-post service until a thoroughly impartial commission can be appointed to investigate and report on same, and oblige

Yours, respectfully,

THE BROWN SHOE CO.,  
Per I. H. SAWYER.

NATIONAL PICKLE & CANNING CO.,  
St. Louis, U. S. A., March 22, 1912.

L. C. DYER, M. C.,  
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: Beg to advise you that I am opposed to the passage of the parcel-post bill now pending in Congress and upon which you will soon be called to vote. Principally because the large cities will be benefited at the expense of the smaller towns. The business of the National Pickle & Canning Co., of which I am assistant general superintendent, is done mainly in the small towns, the prosperity of which means to success of our business and the success of our business means the general prosperity of hundreds of our employees, and it seems to me that, in general, the large mail-order concerns, who are few in number, will be benefited largely at the expense of the small country merchant, of whom there are many scattered about doing good to their communities. I hope the bill gets no further than it now is, and that you will see your way clear to vote against it.

Very truly,

FRANK R. MEYER,  
2229 Henrietta Street.

St. Louis, March 12, 1912.

Hon. L. C. DYER,  
House of Representatives, Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: In reply to your letter of recent date, we believe that parcel post will seriously affect small towns in the interior. We inclose literature that may prove interesting reading.

With kind regards, we remain,

Yours, truly,

H. W. GILDEHAUS & CO.



ST. LOUIS ADVERTISING MEN'S LEAGUE,  
St. Louis, March 27, 1912.

Hon. L. C. DYER,  
House of Representatives, Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: The St. Louis Advertising Men's League, which has the membership of all the leading shoe firms in St. Louis among its membership, are opposed to action on the pending parcel-post bill before the receipt of the report of the commission.

Very truly, yours,

J. A. TROY,  
Assistant Secretary.

St. Louis, Mo., March 25, 1912.

Hon. L. C. DYER,  
Member of Congress, Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: I wish to inform you that I am very much opposed to the parcel-post bill as being a direct blow at the business of this country in a retail way in most every line. The catalogue houses want to make all of us pay for delivering their goods by mail. I do not think the Government ought to go into the express business, as there are many other ways of spending our money, in my opinion, to better advantage.

Hoping you will vote against this bill, and very much oblige,

Yours, respectfully,

J. J. HAMMOND.

St. Louis, March 9, 1912.

Hon. L. C. DYER, Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: Your letter of the 7th to hand, also copy of the Post Office appropriation bill.

We are very glad of the opportunity of protesting to you against that part of it relating to parcel post. We feel that this measure will be detrimental to the business of the retail merchants throughout the small towns in the interior, and will of course indirectly affect the business of jobbers in the smaller cities as well as the larger.

Thanking you for your interest in this matter, we are,

Yours, truly,

JAS. H. FORBES TEA & COFFEE CO.,  
ROBT. M. FORBES, Vice President.

NATIONAL FEDERATION RETAIL MERCHANTS,  
Lexington, Mo., March 6, 1912.

Hon. L. C. DYER, Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: Inclosed herewith you will please find copy of a letter signed by Mr. D. H. Naylor, Jr., and addressed to a number of people in the Northwest country, the object of which is self-explanatory. I desire particularly to call your attention to the marked lines which conclusively prove the contention which the retail merchants of this country have brought forward, that the great agitation for parcel post in this country emanates from the mail-order houses. The original of this letter is on file with the Mississippi Valley Lumberman, Minneapolis, Minn., and can be verified by any Member of Congress. In view of the statements made in this letter I am warranted again in the name of the retail merchants of this country in protesting against the passage of any parcel-post legislation, and I trust that the evidence is so conclusive as to the real purpose and who are the real promoters of this proposed legislation and the objects which they hope to accomplish that you will cast your influence and vote against any action upon this question. Certainly it is of such great importance that before doing so you ought to be willing to have the entire question investigated by a competent commission in order that intelligent action may be had by Congress.

Respectfully,

J. R. MOOREHEAD,

Secretary National Federation Retail Merchants.

[From the Mississippi Valley Lumberman, Feb. 9, 1912.]

THE CATALOGUE HOUSE AND PARCEL POST—OPEN ADMISSION THAT THE LATTER WILL HELP THE FORMER.

During the past few weeks circular letters have been received by a number of people in the Northwest from D. H. Naylor, whose business card announces that he is the fiscal manager for M. W. Savage interests, of Minneapolis. This letter contains a number of statements regarding the great profits made by the catalogue houses, and offers to furnish information concerning the new issue of stock by M. W. Savage Factory (Inc.), for the purpose of financing an extension of business of that concern into a general catalogue house.

The point to which particular attention is called and which is commented upon in the editorial columns of this issue of the Lumberman is that the anticipated parcel-post legislation promises to enable catalogue houses to greatly increase their business. Further comment than that offered in the editorial referred to is not necessary here, excepting to impress the important fact upon all retail dealers that they should at once communicate with their Senators and Representatives in Congress, urging them to oppose the proposed parcel-post legislation. Following is the full text of the letter referred to above:

MINNEAPOLIS, MINN., January 31, 1912.

DEAR SIR: The mail-order business of the "catalogue house" probably offers the greatest possibilities of any industry to-day.

While their profit on an individual article is small, the total profits on the hundreds of thousands of articles sold yearly enable them to earn and pay big dividends.

Take Sears-Roebuck, for instance; their total volume of business last year is reported as being over \$60,000,000. Whether these figures are exactly correct or not, we know this, that they did pay a dividend of 33 1/3 per cent on their common stock after paying 7 per cent on the preferred stock outstanding.

Only a few years ago you could have secured common stock in that company for about \$20 per share; to-day it is selling for about \$180 per share.

Now, one more point regarding this mail-order business. Statistics show it is rapidly increasing, and it is certain that just as soon as the parcel-post legislation is enacted it will without question increase to fifty times its present enormous volume.

During the present year one of the oldest and most successful firms in a special line of the mail-order business in Minneapolis has quietly branched out into a general catalogue house. While its main office will be in this city, it has a Chicago branch to handle the business from Eastern and Southern States.

The first big catalogue is already published, and many thousands of this edition are now in the hands of the consumers throughout the entire country. The orders are coming in in fine shape, and increasing daily.

The company, to take care of the increasing business, is planning on placing a little more of its stock with the investors. If you are in a position to consider an investment during the next month or so, this is a proposition that will be well worth your time to look into carefully. Don't overlook this point: It is an industry with unlimited possibilities and backed by successful and wealthy "interests." If you would like to receive full particulars, look over their catalogue and other mighty interesting data, just mail me the inclosed post card to-day. It will place you under no obligation whatever.

Very truly, yours,

D. H. NAYLOR, JR.

(The original of this letter is in our possession, and can be seen by any interested person.—Editor.)

St. Louis, March 9, 1912.

Hon. L. C. DYER, Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: We have your letter of March 6, asking us for an expression in regard to the proposed parcel-post legislation.

This matter has been so thoroughly thrashed out from every point of view that we can add nothing to the arguments against the adoption of parcel post, but wish to say that in our judgment, and that of our customers, it will work a serious injury to the jobbing and retail interests, thereby indirectly affecting adversely the interests of the farmers and laborers, whose prosperity is thoroughly identified with that of the merchants of the smaller towns. We believe that the investigation which you have no doubt made will bear out the truth of this contention, and we trust that your vote and influence will be recorded against the adoption of the bill.

Thanking you for the courtesy shown us in asking for this expression of opinion, we remain,

Yours, truly,

CARLETON DRY GOODS CO.,  
J. R. CURLEE, Secretary.

KANSAS CITY, MO., March 6, 1912.

Hon. L. C. DYER, Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: We are again advised that some parcel-post bills that are now before the House and Senate have been, or would be, reported favorably by the committees having them in charge.

We believe that it would be a very great mistake for any legislation of this kind to be passed without a more thorough investigation, and we ask again that you use your best endeavors to have a commission appointed to investigate the condition of the parcel post in foreign countries where it is now in force and to fully examine into the difference of conditions prevailing there and those prevailing in the United States.

We are sure that the conditions are so radically different that you would be convinced that the parcel post as outlined by the present bills would not be acceptable or to the advantage of the majority of the people of the United States.

Yours, very truly,

WEBB-FREYSSCHLAG MERCANTILE CO.,  
Per A. JANSSEN.

KANSAS CITY, MO., February 26, 1912.

Hon. L. C. DYER, Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: We wish to enter our protest against the proposed parcel-post measures now pending in Congress, and to ask that you give your voice and vote against their passage. We do this for the very good reasons, as it seems to us, that the parcel post would mean, first, a very great deficit in the postal revenues, not alone because of the cost of carrying same, but in the incidental expense necessary to handling the very greatly increased volume of fourth-class mail.

It would necessarily mean very large additions to most of the post offices in the cities; additional clerks to handle the parcels, and, in case of the rural routes, not only additional salaries to the rural carriers, but provisions for two horses where one is now sufficient, or that four would be necessary where two are now used, together with the increased cost of the vehicles for transporting the additional volume of mails.

We believe, further, that the Government has no right to go into the general carrying business; that it is wrong in theory and would be costly and cumbersome in practice. Further, it is, in a way, very detrimental to the mercantile business of the smaller towns, and will tend logically to the further upbuilding of the large cities and the destruction of the smaller town as a market place. This logically also would mean the destruction of present values of farm properties adjacent to the small towns and would demoralize business and society throughout the country. The demand for this parcel post, we honestly believe, is not a genuine one even on the part of the farmers, but is promulgated by the farm and mail-order papers which depend upon the catalogue and mail-order houses for their subsistence, and they thus foster an apparent demand that is perfunctory and not actually representative of the desires of the farmers themselves except as they are misled by specious arguments to work for it.

If a parcel post is contemplated, we would suggest that Congress appoint a special commission to investigate conditions abroad where parcel post prevails to look into both sides of the question. If it means a reduction of American rural communities to a state similar to those of Europe which "enjoy" parcel post, we do not believe the American people, as represented by their Senators and Representatives in Congress, would stand for it a minute.

Rather than to think of the Government going to the expense of adopting a general or parcel-post extension, allow us to suggest that a real need of the people is for 1-cent letter postage, and we would be very glad indeed to have you support House bill No. 17736.

We have written you at length on this subject because we feel deeply the importance of it to our city and the country in general. We know that we speak for practically every retail implement, vehicle, and hardware dealer in our territory, which is the section lying west of the Mississippi River. It is also the full belief and wish of all the manufacturers and jobbers of these lines, and of the Kansas City Implement Vehicle, and Hardware Club, of which the writer is secretary and treasurer.

We trust you will give this matter the consideration it deserves, and that you will aid us in defeating what we believe to be an onerous measure designed and promulgated in the interest of the mail-order business almost solely.

Respectfully, yours,

IMPLEMENT TRADE JOURNAL CO.

Dictated by W. A. Jones, editor.

Mr. STEENERSON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the Record.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Minnesota asks unanimous consent to extend his remarks in the Record. Is there objection? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none.

Mr. REILLY. Mr. Speaker, I also ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the Record.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Connecticut asks unanimous consent to extend his remarks in the Record. Is there objection? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none.

Mr. MOON of Tennessee. Mr. Chairman, I move that the committee do now rise.

The motion was agreed to.

The committee accordingly rose; and the Speaker having resumed the chair, Mr. HAY, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union, reported that that committee had had under consideration the bill (H. R. 21279) making appropriations for the service of the Post Office Department for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1913, and for other purposes, and had come to no resolution thereon.

#### AMERICAN MEAT (H. DOC. NO. 694).

The SPEAKER laid before the House the following message from the President of the United States, which was read, and, with the accompanying papers, referred to the Committee on Agriculture:

*To the Senate and House of Representatives:*

The Secretary of Agriculture, with my consent, has sent, through the Secretary of the Treasury, to the Congress an estimate for an appropriation of \$1,000,000 beyond the present permanent appropriation for the meat-inspection service in the Department of Agriculture. The increase is necessary to enable the department to inspect microscopically the flesh of hogs that is to be converted into meat food products which ordinarily are eaten without cooking. Several deaths have resulted from eating such products which contained trichinae. The Swiss minister is now seeking reparation on account of the deaths and serious illness of several citizens of Switzerland. These deaths and serious illnesses are claimed to have been caused by eating American meat which contained trichinae. The Department of Agriculture has issued warning circulars and caused notices to be printed in the newspapers of the country concerning the danger of eating such uncooked products. The microscopic inspection of the flesh of all hogs would require an increase of \$4,000,000 in the appropriation. This is not deemed necessary. There is ample authority in the meat-inspection act to make the microscopic inspection, but no money has ever been provided. Therefore I urge upon the Congress the appropriation of \$1,000,000 for this purpose, on the ground that the emergency demands such action.

WM. H. TAFT.

THE WHITE HOUSE, April 12, 1912.

#### ENROLLED BILL SIGNED.

Mr. CRAVENS, from the Committee on Enrolled Bills, reported that they had examined and found truly enrolled bill of the following title, when the Speaker signed the same:

H. R. 20190. An act to extend the time for the construction of a dam across Rock River, Ill.

ENROLLED BILL PRESENTED TO THE PRESIDENT FOR HIS APPROVAL.

Mr. CRAVENS, from the Committee on Enrolled Bills, reported that this day they had presented to the President of the United States for his approval the following bill:

H. R. 20190. An act to extend the time for the construction of a dam across Rock River, Ill.

#### WITHDRAWAL OF PAPERS.

Mr. TAYLOR of Colorado, by unanimous consent, was granted leave to withdraw from the files of the House, without leaving copies, papers in the case of H. R. 20207, Sixtieth Congress, first session, introduced by Congressman Haggot, to pay John O'Connell certain moneys as custodian of old Fort Lyman, no adverse report having been made thereon.

Mr. FLOYD of Arkansas, by unanimous consent, was granted leave to withdraw from the House, without leaving copies, papers in the case of James L. Carpenter (H. R. 5720), first session Sixty-second Congress, no adverse report having been made thereon.

#### LEAVES OF ABSENCE.

By unanimous consent, leaves of absence were granted as follows:

To Mr. DICKSON of Mississippi, indefinitely, on account of illness in family.

To Mr. HENSLEY, for three weeks, on account of important public business.

To Mr. CALLAWAY, for three weeks, on account of important public business.

To Mr. HANNA, for three weeks, on account of important public business.

#### AGREEMENTS BETWEEN EMPLOYERS AND LABORERS.

The SPEAKER laid before the House the following:

The Committee on Labor is hereby discharged from further consideration of H. R. 23180, to make lawful certain agreements between employers and laborers and persons engaged in agriculture or horticulture, and to limit the issuing of injunctions in certain cases, and for other purposes, and the same is hereby referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Mr. BARTLETT. That bill has been referred to the Committee on Labor?

The SPEAKER. Yes, sir.

Mr. BARTLETT. Has the Committee on Labor asked to have its reference changed?

The SPEAKER. No. The Committee on Labor did not ask it. The Committee on the Judiciary did, and all bills of that kind have been formerly referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Mr. BARTLETT. I do not care to take issue with the Speaker on that statement, but the change of reference, except by unanimous consent, is made in a way pointed out by the rules, as I understand it.

The SPEAKER. Unanimous consent is exactly what we are trying to get.

Mr. BARTLETT. I know the rule. The Clerk read the statement that the reference of the bill was to be changed from the Committee on Labor to the Committee on the Judiciary. The rule, as I understand it, is that it must be done by unanimous consent, otherwise by motion at request from one of the two committees.

The SPEAKER. The usual modus operandi is that the Clerk reads the statement, whatever it is, and then the Chair says, "Without objection, the change will be made."

Mr. BARTLETT. Now, Mr. Speaker, I want to say this with reference to that bill: It is a bill drawn by myself and Senator BACON; and the bill introduced in the Senate was referred to the Committee on Education and Labor, of which Senator BORAH is chairman. I will say that when I introduced the bill in the House I indorsed on it, "Referred to Committee on Labor," and am responsible for the reference to that committee. I wrote on it myself that it was referred to the Committee on Labor, because the bill, as its title indicated, had reference to disputes between employers and laborers and employees. While I have no objection to its being referred to the Committee on the Judiciary—as there are some things in it on which they would have jurisdiction—there are some things in it over which the Committee on Labor has jurisdiction. If the Committee on the Judiciary desire to have this bill referred to it, and make it known in a proper way, I will raise no objection to that. If the Committee on Labor, to which it has been referred, desire that the bill be not considered by that committee, but by the Judiciary Committee, I will have no objection to that. But I have not been consulted as to the change of reference, and I think I should have been. Therefore, at present, with really no objection, however, as to where it goes—either to the Committee on the Judiciary or the Committee on Labor—I shall object.

#### RECESS.

At 5 o'clock and 30 minutes p. m., in accordance with the order previously agreed to, the House took a recess until 7 o'clock and 30 minutes p. m.

#### AFTER RECESS.

At 7 o'clock and 30 minutes p. m., the recess having expired, the Speaker called the House to order.

Mr. MOON of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the further consideration of the Post Office appropriation bill.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the House resolved itself into Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the consideration of the bill H. R. 21279, with Mr. SAUNDERS in the chair.

The CHAIRMAN. The House is in Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the further consideration of House bill 21279, making appropriations for the Post Office Department.

Mr. MOON of Tennessee. Mr. Chairman, I yield to the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. BATHRICK] 25 minutes.

Mr. BATHRICK. Mr. Chairman, I have frequently noted that part of the routine of the House in which this is appro-



privately called "the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union." I understand, of course, that we have been considering this afternoon a very important bill, the Post Office appropriation bill. But I desire to say something on the state of the Union that will be of importance and interest to the Members of the House and perhaps to the whole country upon another subject with which I am intimately acquainted and, I think, quite important.

For many weeks a very hard-worked committee—the Committee on Expenditures in the Department of Agriculture—has been busy in the investigation of that department, and the subject of their more recent investigation has been popularly known as the Everglades investigation. Now, it is my purpose to deal with some of the matters in connection with that investigation which were not properly in all respects admitted in the testimony, because there was a regular line drawn by which the committee was to conduct its examinations. There was a regular plan mapped out, and a great deal of the testimony and matter which was correlative and which was in many respects important evidence was not admissible under the plan of investigation.

I desire to say that I do not in any respect intend any discourtesy to that committee nor to its very efficient chairman, Mr. Moss, and do not desire to forestall its report, which will appear before the Members of this House in due time. But in treating the subject I am obliged to deal with the facts which that committee will eventually no doubt include in its report.

In the latter part of 1907 a field force of engineers, in charge of one J. O. Wright, an employee of the Bureau of Drainage Investigations of the Department of Agriculture, was sent to Florida to investigate a plan for draining a large portion of the Everglades. In June, 1908, Mr. Wright made his report to his superior officer, Dr. C. G. Elliott, who was chief of this bureau. This report has not yet been published by the department, except in abstract form, and has not been published at all outside of Senate Document No. 89, which was printed upon the assumed authority of a resolution passed through the United States Senate August 7, 1911, or more than three years after this report was made. Let it be understood that Senate Document No. 89 was not published at the instigation of the Department of Agriculture or any of its officials, and does not contain the full report which, in its final revision, was the one which the department was willing to stand for as correct. Hence, it is true that the department has never published this report.

The object of the investigation was to ascertain whether certain allegations that had been made by Congressman CLARK and myself were true. One of the allegations was that the department had suppressed a certain part of the report at the instigation of those who were interested in the sale of Everglade lands. No. 2 was, as a sidelight upon the matter and really not material, that Secretary Wilson, when requested to give the reason why he had suppressed this part of the report, said he was running the department for the benefit of fools who did not know better than to buy land which they had not seen.

I had appeared before the committee asking for an investigation, and Mr. CLARK had also appeared for the same purpose. Hence the aim of Solicitor McCabe, in his defense of the Secretary, was to strike at us. He attempted to show that we were actuated by selfish and improper motives. In an effort to discredit Congressman CLARK he produced correspondence which was utterly irrelevant to the inquiry, inconsequential, and finally revealing his futile attempt to prove that CLARK himself was a dealer in land that might be in competition with the Everglades, and hence that CLARK's motives showed bias and were not altogether disinterested. All that Solicitor McCabe brought out on this point was that Mr. CLARK had casually, not as a man in the real-estate business—for he never was in that business—but simply incidentally, written one or two letters to some gentlemen who had asked him to find for them a piece of land in the State of Florida.

Mr. CLARK wrote to them about one piece of land only, which he did not own himself and which was at least 250 miles distant from the Everglades, of an entirely different character of soil, and consequently not in competition with the Everglades in any manner. Mr. CLARK has no land whatever in the State of Florida for sale, and this imputation upon his motives in asking for this investigation was wholly unfounded and without basis of fact.

Having thus assailed Mr. CLARK's motives, the Secretary seized upon an opportunity to make a statement regarding a farm which I have in Florida, and upon which the chief product raised is potatoes. The attempt to induce the public, in widely published newspaper reports, to believe that I have conflicting interests in Florida, and that for this reason I demanded this investigation, is "very small potatoes," indeed.

It is true that I am part owner of 160 acres, situated over 300 miles from the Everglades in question. This property is purely a farm proposition. I have no land in Florida for sale, and this farm is not for sale, except under those conditions which might arise wherein any person might desire or be called upon to sell any property which he might own. I am in no way, directly or indirectly, interested in the real-estate business in the State of Florida, and I have no business connection of any character which would bring me into competition with the Florida Everglades. But my ownership in this farm and the experience in Florida agriculture, running over a period of 9 to 10 years, is in truth the very reason why I have been interested in the investigation of the Florida Everglades carried on by the Moss committee. I believe that the manner employed by the land sharks of Florida in exploiting the Everglades was an exhibition of unusually bold misrepresentation and exaggeration, and I sought, in my official capacity, to assist, as far as possible, in saving the innocent poor people of this country from loss and disappointment.

Mr. AKIN of New York. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BATHRICK. Not now. I will yield later, but I prefer to go on with my statement at this time.

Mr. Chairman, there is no hope born in the human breast more wholesome and sacred than the hunger for home, wherein the beautiful visions of those not blessed with wealth by birth conjure to the mind of the struggling poor pictures of domestic happiness, comfort, and plenty, which can only be realized by the ownership of a home. Millions of our people are without this blessing, and those who clothe a lie in the habiliments of truth, and use it to delude the home seeker, are the vilest of all impostors and the most worthy of that indignant condemnation and odium deserved by any class of culprits who commit wrong in the name of business.

On some other occasion it will be my pleasure to deal with the question of the feasibility of the drainage proposition of the Everglades, and of the availability for agricultural purposes of this land, should they ever succeed in draining them; but at this time I desire to consider more fully those matters which bear upon the attitude of those defending the Department of Agriculture and Secretary Wilson in this investigation.

During Secretary Wilson's pretended testimony, which in many respects appeared to me as a plain evasion of testifying, he made vague and ambiguous reference to the subject of liars in this and other countries. Shortly thereafter, by way of more direct connection with those witnesses who were the object of his spleen, in pointed allusion he accused Congressman CLARK, W. R. Hardee, and Capt. Sewell of having framed up their testimony. In other words, when not specifically referring to those gentlemen, he accused them of collusion in the arrangement of their evidence.

Congressman CLARK, Mr. Hardee, and Capt. Sewell had sworn the Secretary told them he had suppressed a certain circular at the instigation of those interested in the Everglade lands. If Secretary Wilson had done this, he did a great wrong, and he knew it; and it was very natural for Solicitor McCabe and the Secretary to cover up the fact and attempt to prove that he suppressed the circular for some other reason. This circular was an abstract in brief of the material features of the report which was made to Dr. Elliott by Mr. Wright and was used merely for the purpose of expediting office business. It was a sort of mimeograph letter, not for general circulation, but to use in reply to hundreds of inquirers who had written to the Department of Agriculture to secure information respecting Everglade lands. Rich land speculators had purchased land from the State of Florida by the hundreds of thousands of acres at \$2 per acre and were selling them for from twenty-five to as high as sixty and seventy-five dollars per acre. Millions of pieces of literature had been sent out by them, many thousands had purchased small parcels on the installment plan, and other thousands were contemplating purchasing under these alluring representations. These were the inquirers who were writing to the department for information. Their letters came into Dr. Elliott's department. To have written each an original letter, giving the facts they desired, would have been a tedious undertaking. Consequently the circular was prepared, approved by Dr. Elliott, and sent to each inquirer with a brief letter calling their attention to the inclosure.

I will print this circular, and a casual perusal will show why those interested in the sale of Everglade lands would desire its suppression:

#### EXHIBIT B.

[United States Department of Agriculture, Office of Experiment Stations.]

#### DRAINAGE INVESTIGATIONS—THE EVERGLADES OF FLORIDA.

Under acts of Congress granting to the States the Federal swamp and overflowed lands within their borders the State of Florida acquired the area known as the Everglades. The tract is, roughly, 100 miles long

and 40 miles wide, extending from Lake Okechobee to the southern end of the peninsula.

The reclamation and development of the Everglades has long been desired by the State, and a number of years ago some canals were excavated in the Kissimmee River Valley and west and southwest of Lake Okechobee. In 1906 the State secured the assistance of the Office of Experiment Stations, United States Department of Agriculture, and during the next two winters Drainage Investigations of that office conducted a survey and examinations, including a line of levels from Fort Myers to Lake Okechobee, south about 30 miles to Brown's store, and directly east across the Everglades to the vicinity of Pompano.

The climate of southern Florida seems as healthful as that of other localities having the same latitude. The United States Weather Bureau records from Jupiter and Fort Myers show that from 1898 to 1906, inclusive, the maximum temperature was 96° F. and the minimum 24°. The long and hot summers are usually very irksome to the people from more northern States, but do not seem detrimental to the health.

The normal annual rainfall in southern Florida is nearly 60 inches and the precipitation has reached 70 inches in a year. The wettest season is usually the months of July and August. The area of Lake Okechobee is approximately 733 square miles, and the water from seven and one-half times this area of land, lying to the north, flows into the lake. During the rainy season the lake overflows along the southern boundary. This overflow, together with the excessive rainfall upon the area, causes the swampy condition characteristic of the Everglades.

The soil of these lands consists largely of decayed and partly decayed vegetable matter, having the nature of muck or peat. This is underlaid at a depth of from 2 to 10 feet, deepest near the south edge of Lake Okechobee, with a white sand or with a limestone formation. The principal vegetation is saw grass. In places near the border of the Glades are the "hammock lands," as they are locally known. The "hammocks" are small areas of from 1 to sometimes 10 acres, rising 1 or 2 feet above the surrounding muck. The soil is more sandy, usually supporting a growth of hardwood trees.

The State has sold large tracts in the Glades to companies that are now offering these lands for sale. The State retains the ownership of alternate sections throughout the tracts, but has sold several hundred thousand acres for about \$2 per acre, agreeing to expend about \$1.50 per acre toward drainage. Since 1906 the State has had dredges at work near Fort Lauderdale and since last spring in the vicinity of Miami; a dredge has also been at work in the Caloosahatchee River. A number of miles of canals have been excavated, and it does not seem improbable that as this work progresses the land bordering the canals will be at least partially drained, but undoubtedly much time will yet be required before any considerable areas will be habitable or fitted for cultivation.

For the drainage of the Everglades a very complete system of main ditches and laterals will be required and farm ditches in detail. Also in this soil provision must be made for irrigation or for maintaining the water in the ditches and soil at a fairly uniform depth, not too low, in order that there may always be sufficient moisture for the production of crops and to prevent the liability of the muck catching fire and burning.

The drainage of the Everglades is entirely feasible from an engineering standpoint, but the value of the lands when drained is still largely problematical. Some small drained tracts on the edge of the Glades have produced very satisfactory crops of vegetables. Usually, but not always, large quantities of fertilizers have been used. Several years ago sugar cane was grown on well-drained land near Kissimmee, considerably north of Lake Okechobee, and it appears that the yield of sugar should have been profitable on this plantation. On some of the hammock lands oranges and grapefruit have been raised, but for these large quantities of commercial fertilizers are almost always required.

Further information regarding the conditions in southern Florida will be issued later by the Office of Experiment Stations, United States Department of Agriculture, with an outline for the main drainage system to reclaim about 1,800,000 acres of the Everglades lying between Miami and Lake Okechobee and about the lake. Further than the preparation of such a drainage plan the National Government is doing nothing toward the drainage of the Everglades and has made no appropriation from which any such works may be constructed. The results of some preliminary investigations made near Miami in 1904 are published in Separate 9 from Office of Experiment Stations Bulletin 158. This publication and Farmers' Bulletin 238, "Citrus Fruit Growing in the Gulf States," may be obtained by addressing the Secretary of Agriculture, Washington, D. C. The director of the agricultural experiment station at Gainesville, Fla., can probably furnish information regarding soils and crops. The officials having charge of the drainage work being done by the State are the board of trustees of the Internal Improvement fund, Tallahassee, Fla.

JANUARY, 1910.

Please notice, in this connection, that I state that this circular was approved by Dr. Elliott, who was chief and scientific expert of the drainage department, and if he approved it, such approval came from the highest authority on that subject in the Department of Agriculture. The probe of the investigation centered around this circular, as the publication which had been suppressed, the full report not having been issued. To be sure an excerpt of this report was sent to Mr. Hall, of Colorado Springs, a wealthy land speculator, and also to the governor of Florida. This excerpt, by permission of the Secretary, was published in Florida, and those convenient and favorable parts which suited the land sharks were published in their literature and given prominence as the report of the United States Government and starred as a national indorsement of the whole Everglades scheme.

It is very evident that Solicitor McCabe's plan of defense was an attempt to show that Secretary Wilson never saw the circular until the day he suppressed it, and to show that the immediate cause or instigator of the suppression was not connected with the "Everglade interests." The circular was suppressed in the presence of Senator FLETCHER on the 4th of February, 1910. It is a fact that influences of "Everglade interests" behind Senator FLETCHER, and from other sources, were active in securing the suppression of this circular. It appears very plainly that while "Everglade interests" were hiding behind the Senator that

Secretary Wilson was also attempting to conceal his true motive for suppressing the circular behind the Senator also and bring forward a "framed-up" motive. It does not appear that Senator FLETCHER himself was in any way involved other than as a medium through which the "Everglade interests" operated. The "Everglade interests" were hiding behind Senator FLETCHER, and if Solicitor McCabe could show that these interests never appeared before the Secretary before Senator FLETCHER's visit it might be possible to give some other reason than "Everglade interests" why the Secretary suppressed the circular. But the reasonable inference from the evidence clearly establishes the fact that "Everglade interests" came directly to the Secretary before Senator FLETCHER arrived and asked that the circular be suppressed.

In attempting to ascertain whether the Secretary did actually suppress this circular at the instigation of "Everglade interests," as was sworn to by Congressman CLARK, W. R. Hardee, and Capt. Sewell, I will take the facts that are the closest to the date of and the reason for the suppression. One of the most pointed facts relating to the question of the influence of "Everglade interests" is contained in a telegram dated February 3, 1910, which was sent to the Hon. D. U. FLETCHER, United States Senator from Florida, at Washington, D. C., by Gov. N. B. Broward, then governor of Florida. Gov. Broward at that time was publicly known to be the owner of many thousands of acres of this Everglade land, which fact he himself publicly acknowledged. This telegram is as follows:

Received a telegram, "Bulletin coming out from Agricultural Department knocking Everglades." I earnestly ask that you investigate and prevent any such action, if you can. I understand that Dr. H. W. Wiley, Chief Chemist Agricultural Department, is opposed to having his name used by companies selling Everglade land. They claim to quote Dr. Wiley's report to Secretary of Agriculture, 1891, page 170. They think they had a right to print excerpts of report, it being a public document. Am writing.

N. B. BROWARD.

Let us see if this telegram indicates any "Everglade interests" influence in the matter. First, I desire to state in justice to Senator FLETCHER that it does not appear that he acted in the matter other than in an intermediary capacity, and that upon receipt of a telegram from the governor of his State. Any Senator or Member of the House of Representatives receiving a telegram from the governor of his State asking him to do certain things would probably be expeditious in complying with the request. Senator FLETCHER received the telegram on the 4th of February, 1910, and did act expeditiously. Note that the telegram asks him to stop a "bulletin" which was knocking the Everglades. Gov. Broward, being himself an owner of Everglade lands, naturally did not want this "bulletin" published. It turns out that the publication the governor referred to as a "bulletin" was a circular, and he asks that the Senator stop it.

Is there not indication of "Everglade interests" in that? Senator FLETCHER went down to see the Secretary. After receiving this request from the governor, did he go there to stop the circular or not? The telegram begins by saying, "Received a telegram." Who did Gov. Broward receive this telegram from? Was it from other "Everglade interests," who wanted the circular stopped as well as did the governor? The telegram also stated that Dr. Wiley is opposed to having his name used by companies selling Everglade lands. In other words, the companies which are selling Everglade lands are in trouble with Dr. Wiley. Who told Gov. Broward that the Everglade lands sale companies were in trouble with Dr. Wiley? Was it not the Everglade sales companies themselves who told him this? The telegram states, "Am writing." The governor did write, and Senator FLETCHER received the letter. The Senator was asked to produce this letter, but declined. No one can tell, consequently, what the details of this letter might have shown respecting "Everglade interests." The Senator was asked if the letter disclosed the name of the man who wired to Gov. Broward, and he stated it did. Asked if he would furnish the name, he stated that he would, but did not.

Please remember that the date upon this telegram is part of the evidence that fixes the fact that that circular was suppressed on February 4, 1910, the day Senator FLETCHER called upon the Secretary. Another evidence, indicating that it was suppressed on that day, is shown in the fact that after the 4th of February, 1910, copies of letters sent to those inquirers who kept writing to the department showed no longer any reference to "circular inclosed." As a matter of fact, everybody on both sides agrees that it was suppressed February 4, 1910.

On the morning of February 4, the Senator being in possession of this telegram, received a visit from one M. L. Bowen. M. L. Bowen was manager of the Everglades Lands Sales Co., in Washington, D. C. How did he know that Senator FLETCHER might need the circular that day? If he did not know it, is it not a remarkable coincidence that he happened to appear in



the Senator's office with the circular about the same time the Senator received the telegram? M. L. Bowen represents another indication of the "Everglades interests" activity in securing the suppression of this circular. Did M. L. Bowen telegraph Gov. Broward about this circular? Or did Bowen telegraph his headquarters at Chicago and they in turn telegraph the governor? One point here is worth remembering also. This circular had been used for some time prior to February 3 to answer inquirers. "Everglade interests" certainly knew that it was out before February 3. This circular threw the whole Everglade crowd up in the air, and they were busy telegraphing, writing, and trying to stop it. That must have taken some time before they finally got Senator FLETCHER in action on February 4. That fact is worth remembering in connection with the testimony and conduct of a Mr. Will and another man by the name of Howe, both of whom were connected with "Everglade interests."

On the morning of the 4th of February, 1910, Senator FLETCHER took the circular given to him by M. L. Bowen and called upon Secretary Wilson. This circular, although a fair and honest abstract of the whole report as to all matters referred to in it, contains statements which were positively injurious to the "Everglade interests," and upon the face of it is evidence that they were desirous of having it stopped.

It is difficult to ascertain from the testimony what happened when Senator FLETCHER called on Secretary Wilson. The Secretary says that the Senator did not ask him to suppress it. He says also that the Senator did not discuss the circular. He can not remember that Senator FLETCHER showed him Gov. Broward's telegram, but the Senator is inclined to think he did show it to him. If the Secretary saw that telegram, how is it possible that he did not know that "Everglade interests" were demanding the suppression of this circular? If you had gone down there with a like message, would you not have shown to the Secretary a telegram from a man so high in authority as the governor of Florida? Whatever else happened, it is agreed that the Senator gave the circular to the Secretary. The Secretary pressed a button at his desk, and Mr. Arnold came in. Mr. Arnold, as respects department publications, is the man who stands next to the Secretary in authority. In Mr. Arnold's close relation to the Secretary, how was it that he had never called the attention of the Secretary to this circular before? The Secretary immediately directed Mr. Arnold to have the thing discontinued, saying, according to Senator FLETCHER's testimony, "This is not part of our business; we are here to furnish scientific data and the result of scientific investigation." In almost a moment's time he emphatically directed Mr. Arnold to stop the circular. Now, how did the Secretary know this was not scientific data, if that is the real reason why this circular was suppressed? Of course, Solicitor McCabe's defense, aiming to disprove the statement that the Secretary suppressed the circular at the instigation of the "Everglade interests," it would be quite natural to give some other reason. In support of this other reason the Secretary must say that the circular was not scientific, and, as he intimated in his testimony, crude.

If that is the real reason why he suppressed this circular, how could the Secretary know on such a brief examination that the circular was crude and unscientific? Why did he not send for Dr. Elliott, who is the foremost drainage expert in the world, and who approved this circular? Dr. Elliott is recognized as an authority on drainage in this country and abroad. He is referred to as such in the Encyclopedia Britannica, and his textbooks are used in many colleges and universities throughout this country and others. How was Secretary Wilson to know so quickly that this circular was crude and unscientific? There are many scientific subjects treated in the Department of Agriculture, by specialists employed for that purpose. Does Secretary Wilson embody within himself all such special scientific knowledge that he is enabled to pass judgment on these matters so quickly without consulting the educated men of the departments? Is it not a very transparent fact that this "crude and unscientific" reason for the suppression of this circular is a sham, and was trumped up merely for the purpose of trying to disprove the statements made by W. R. Hardee, Capt. Sewell, and Congressman CLARK, that the Secretary suppressed it at the instigation of those interested in the Everglades? The Secretary infers that W. R. Hardee, Capt. Sewell, and Congressman CLARK lied, and that their testimony was a product of collusion. Will anybody in this House believe this of Congressman CLARK, who has for many years labored in behalf of his constituents and the country as a courageous, efficient, and honorable public servant? CLARK had no interest in lying, and I defy anybody to show any such, either personal or political. Why should W. R. Hardee lie about it? Hardee's testimony was straight from the shoulder, unequivocal, and neither he nor Capt. Sewell had the remotest interest in the

subject. They are men of the highest standing and the best reputation for honesty and integrity in the community where they reside.

Here are three good men and true, who swore that the Secretary of Agriculture did say that he suppressed the circular at the instigation of "Everglades interests," and I think it is very plain that he did say it, and that at that time he did tell the truth, but afterwards repented having told the truth. The Secretary states that on the 4th of February, 1910, the day Senator FLETCHER called, was the first time he had seen that circular. The Everglades project was a big subject. It was not one of those small matters that might pass through the department unnoticed by the biggest men in it. It was talked about and discussed generally by all hands from the Drainage Department up to the Secretary. But it is plain that if the Secretary had been familiar with that circular before that 4th of February Solicitor McCabe's defense would fall. If the Secretary had been familiar with the circular before that, while it was being sent out, he could not have risen in his wrath and denounced it as unscientific, as it is alleged he did.

Strange testimony was given by a man by the name of Will. This man's testimony is shifty, equivocal, and abounding in terms employed by that character of witness who feels himself treading upon unsafe ground. Read it over and see for yourself if this is not true. Let us look at this testimony.

Will swore that a Mr. Howe, who was an Everglades lands salesman, came to him and showed him this circular. Howe was indignant because the circular was a knock on the Everglades, and he and Will talked the circular over for an hour, and then they both went to the Department of Agriculture. Will states that he was interested in Everglades as a buyer, but hypocritically avers that he had not yet been convinced regarding its virtues sufficiently enough to be a seller of it. In other words, he states that he liked the land well enough to buy it himself, but in his superlative goodness had not yet learned enough about it to start in and sell it to others.

Both he and Howe, then, were interested in Everglade lands when they called at the department and saw Dr. True, Dr. Arnold, and Dr. C. G. Elliott. Will swears that Howe boldly and aggressively demanded of Dr. True and Dr. Elliott the suppression of that circular. Both Dr. True and Dr. Elliott state that he was loud, boisterous, and discourteous, and told them that if they did not suppress it he would go to Secretary Wilson. Will swears that the day on which they called at the department was the 7th or 8th of February, 1910. As I have already shown, everybody agrees that the circular was suppressed on the 4th of February, 1910.

Dr. True and Dr. Elliott refused to suppress the circular on Howe's demand, and then on the same day, and very shortly after they had been "bold and aggressive" with Dr. True and Dr. Elliott in their demand to have the circular suppressed, they did go to see Secretary Wilson. But Will swears and Secretary Wilson swears that when they were in his presence on that visit the circular was not mentioned. They were "bold and aggressive" in demanding of Dr. Elliott and Dr. True that the circular should be suppressed, and in that frame of mind they went to Secretary Wilson, as they had threatened to do. But when they got to him, according to the testimony, they did not even mention the circular, which Howe said had already lost him \$20,000. Howe must have taken his loss lightly to have forgotten it as soon as he came in the presence of the Secretary.

If there is anything sure on this earth, it is that Will and Howe called on Dr. True and Dr. Elliott before that circular was suppressed—before February 4, 1910—and they did not call on them on February 7 or 8, 1910. The order had come through from Secretary Wilson on the 4th of February, 1910, to Dr. True and Dr. Elliott to suppress the circular, and they had suppressed it.

Who can believe that if Will and Howe called on them on the 7th or 8th of February and made demand that the circular be suppressed that either Dr. True or Dr. Elliott would not have told them that it had been suppressed? But what is the reason that Solicitor McCabe tried to make it appear that Will and Howe came on the 7th or 8th of February instead of before the 4th of February?

The reason is that had it appeared that they visited the Secretary before he had suppressed the circular it would have been strong inference that he did it at the instigation of those who were interested in Everglade lands and not because it was crude and unscientific. Both Will and Howe were representing Everglade interests, and if it was shown that they called on the Secretary before the circular was suppressed it would have been a corroborative fact to support the statement made by Congressman CLARK, W. R. Hardee, and Capt. Sewell. It is absurd to assume that Will and Howe did not call upon the Secretary before February 4, and it is absurd

to assume that, in their frame of mind, they did not mention the circular to him during that visit.

Whether the Secretary stated that he was not running the department for the protection of fools who did not know any better than to buy land they had not seen, or not, is not particularly material, but the fact is that after the circular was suppressed the Secretary sent out another kind of a letter to inquirers. In this he expressed it as "his judgment, no one should invest money in land without seeing it first." Congressman CLARK, W. R. Hardee, and Capt. Sewell aver that the Secretary did say so, and it is evident from his opinion expressed in this letter that his mind dwelt upon thoughts of this character.

But after the Secretary had suppressed the circular letter on the alleged grounds that it was "crude and unscientific," let us look at and consider the letter he himself sent out and see whether there is anything crude and unscientific about that. In this letter he told inquirers that the department had "no publication regarding these lands." The department had expended the people's money to get information about the Everglades. This information was given to land speculators and to the State of Florida, but the Secretary suppressed the circular and then wrote to inquirers, telling them that the department had no "publication," notwithstanding that it was in possession of the entire report at that moment. The word "publication" is a subterfuge and a mere evasion. The circular was to all intents and purposes a publication, but he had suppressed it. The circular gave the people some facts; but what did the letter give them which he wrote after he had suppressed the circular? It told them, those who inquired, to ask the trustees of the internal improvement fund, at Tallahassee, Fla., for information. These trustees have entire charge of the Everglades project, and I do not intend to reflect in any manner upon them. They had sold for the State a large quantity of land to R. H. Bolles, who was the man with big money behind several of these Everglades sales companies. During the investigation former Attorney General Ellis, of Florida, represented this board of trustees, and on inquiry informed the committee that he not only represented them, but he represented also R. J. Bolles, the big chief exploiter of Everglades. He also stated that at the time he became attorney for the trustees he told them he was Bolles's attorney and that the trustees did not object to it. These trustees had a contract in behalf of the State as one of the parties and Bolles as the other, and they consented that Gen. Ellis should be attorney for both. This illustrates very plainly the communion of interests between the board of trustees of the internal improvement fund and the Everglades lands promoters. Gen. Ellis explained that the State's interests were bound up with the Everglades promoters, because if these promoters succeeded in selling large quantities of their lands and colonizing them it would increase the value of the State land. Now, there is where the "joke" appears in the Secretary's letter.

He refers all inquirers to this board of trustees. In other words, he suppresses information direct from the scientists of this great Agricultural Department, and tells the inquirers to get it from the board of trustees, and the board of trustees turns the letters of the inquirers over to the Everglades sales speculators, because the State is interested in seeing them succeed. Then the land speculators write to the inquirers for the purpose of selling their land, all of which, boiled down, means that Secretary Wilson turned these inquirers over to the tender mercy of "Everglade interests." That is not "crude and unscientific," is it? That is another of the Secretary's jokes, which is side-splitting humor, indeed.

Now, I desire to speak, before closing, of another Agricultural Department joke. I will call this the "Juggernaut joke." A case where faithful, loyal employees are beset by the tyranny and persecution of those who manipulate a contemptible bureaucracy. This is the case of Dr. C. G. Elliott and Mr. A. D. Morehouse. When it appeared that this investigation was imminent the department began to prepare its defense. It was intimated to C. G. Elliott that he would be the goat, and he was ordered to produce every scrap of information bearing upon this Everglades report and deliver it to Solicitor McCabe. After he had obeyed this order, and he himself was possessed of no correspondence bearing upon the subject, he and his assistant, Mr. Morehouse, were summarily dismissed. The real reason why they were discharged was the same reason why Glavis and Kirby, of the Ballinger case, were discharged, namely, to get them out of the way and out of reach of any fact that they might produce to sustain their own contentions and prove that some one higher up was culpable. That was the real reason, but it was not the reason that Solicitor McCabe succeeded in resurrecting from the years gone by.

J. O. Wright, above referred to, had left the Agricultural Department and had taken employment at more than twice his Government salary from the trustees of the internal improvement fund of the State of Florida. Dr. Elliott had seen fit, for apparent good reasons, to revise Wright's report. His revision was not suitable to Wright's employers. And in the controversy that arose because of this revision and the incidental withholding from publication of Wright's report, as submitted by him, Dr. Elliott incurred the antagonism of all Everglade promoters. Wright's report was highly colored and favorable in many respects to the business of selling Everglades, while Dr. Elliott's revision was scientific and would not serve as an advertisement for the Everglade promoters. Dr. Elliott, thus having incurred the antagonism of Everglade promoters and the hatred of Wright, the investigation being imminent, the Secretary, instead of taking that side of the question represented by his expert in the drainage department, found it desirable to get rid of Elliott and his assistant, Morehouse, who knew too much about the facts that would be brought out in the coming investigation. It was also desirable to do something to them that would frighten them into silence and to hang over their heads a threat of revenge if they attempted to tell the truth. They were accused of falsifying the accounts of the department. The case was taken before the grand jury at the instigation of Solicitor McCabe—the same McCabe in the Wiley case—and they were indicted. McCabe went back in the records three years and took up a technical charge against them wherein the Government stood to lose nothing and the accused stood to make not one cent.

The charge grew out of the appropriation made for the purpose of carrying on the departments of drainage and irrigation investigations. That was in 1909, which was the last year that these two separate subjects, or divisions, were cared for in one appropriation, and which method of appropriation was alone responsible for the condition resulting in alleged falsification of accounts. Dr. Elliott went west on a business trip, leaving a safe balance for drainage and enough to care for all outstanding obligations, with surplus to turn back into the Treasury. During his absence bills incurred by irrigation were dumped onto the doctor's drainage account, leaving him with a deficit. This was a mere juggling of bookkeeping, and if there was to be a deficit the irrigation side of the accounts should have taken it. Dr. Elliott had nothing to do with this book deficit, neither had his assistant, Mr. Morehouse, anything to do with it. But they had incurred Solicitor McCabe's and Secretary Wilson's displeasure, and the technical charge was found a very convenient method by which to get rid of them and punish them for telling the truth about the Everglades scandal. There was no intent on the part of Dr. Elliott or of Dr. Morehouse to make a cent, and there was no chance for the Government to lose a cent. That same scheme has been going on in the Government for many years. I do not uphold it, and it was an irregularity. But I say this, that Solicitor McCabe knew at that time of many other such instances, and if he could rise in his official capacity and rush forward the prosecution of those who had "falsified" accounts in that manner in these cases, why did he not arise in his wrath and do so also in the other cases?

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. MOON of Tennessee. Mr. Chairman, I yield 10 minutes more to the gentleman.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Ohio [Mr. BATHRICK] is recognized for 10 minutes more.

Mr. BATHRICK. Now, the papers of this country have spread abroad the news that as a result of this investigation these two men have been indicted. The indictment is not a result of the investigation, but it is the result of the operation of the steam roller by autocratic tyrants in the Department of Agriculture. That is what it is the result of.

Understand, neither Elliott nor Morehouse could have made a cent, neither could the Government lose a cent, by the transaction, but it was a technical violation of the law; and I say to you that this thing has been going on in some departments of the Government for many years. I do not defend the practice, but if Elliott and Morehouse are to be ground to atoms in the cogs of this tyrannical bureaucratic machine I will do the very best I know how to see that some other people are given opportunity for explanation on the same count, and how high up in the Agriculture Department it will reach will remain to be seen.

Dr. Elliott is 62 years old, a quiet, inoffensive, unobtrusive, studious, scientific man, wedded to his occupation, loyal to his country, and beloved by all who know him. His sweet, loving wife came to me weeping, bowed down with this burden that has been placed upon them, and begged that I should tell the



truth about this affair. They did not fear the truth; but in the operation of this contemptible persecution these old people, deprived of the salary that the department has been paying the doctor for years, have been obliged to draw upon their slender resources for the purpose of defraying the unusual expenses of collating evidence and preparing to defend themselves against this unrighteous charge and save their honor. The newspapers of this country have not known the story. If they have, they have not printed it. The word has gone out that the findings of this investigation resulted in the indictment of these two men. Dr. Elliott, like Dr. Wiley, was an ornament to the Department of Agriculture, but was obnoxious to the autocrats who stand at the throttle of the department steam roller.

The leakage from this department of cotton-crop reports a few years ago, the investigation of the department in the Wiley case, wherein a beneficent law, intended to protect the people of this country against poisonous food, was shown to be emasculated and destroyed by the Secretary—up to this time the management of this department has been a scandal and a disgrace to this country.

Only as short a time ago as March there was before the department consideration of the interstate shipment of doctored grain, grain that had been sulphurized for the purpose of concealing its quality and making it appear as of a higher grade. Now, what happened? Dr. Galloway, Secretary Wilson, and Dr. Wiley discussed what should be the procedure of the department in the matter. Finally Secretary Wilson requested Dr. Wiley to prepare a food-inspection decision prohibiting the shipment of this moldy chemicalized grain. Dr. Wiley ordered Dr. Doolittle to proceed to draw the decision, but before this decision was drawn or could be put into effect there was a meeting of the National Grain Dealers' Association at Washington at the Willard Hotel. The report of the proceedings of the meeting of the association carries the statement that Messrs. Wayne and Cornelius, who called on Secretary Wilson, gave out a memorandum of the interview, which states:

Secretary Wilson stated that the matter of seizure of grain out of condition had not as yet been called to his attention, and that he did not propose having any seizures made until he had had time to thoroughly investigate the matter himself.

This in face of the fact that, as above stated, he had only a few days before that had the conference with Dr. Wiley and Dr. Galloway, Mr. Reese and Assistant Secretary Hays being present part of the time. The Secretary said it had not yet come to his attention. Who lied? After the interview with Mr. Wayne and Mr. Cornelius the Secretary ordered the agreed-upon decision withdrawn.

That was the last straw, and Dr. Wiley resigned. Prior to this there had been another case respecting the sulphurization of dried fruit from California. The use of this class of preservative in dried fruits was a questionable process, and the department had decided to stop it, but a great cry went up from the growers and driers in California.

Secretary Wilson made a trip West, asserting that he went there for the purpose of looking into the question of forest reserves, but while there he saw the California fruit men and yielded to their expostulations and made arrangements whereby they could continue shipping the chemicalized fruit.

Secretary Wilson has been wondrous kind to the food dopers. He was kind to the fruit dealers who sulphurized their products. He was kind to the shippers of moldy grain, against the advice of his scientists, and reversed his own decision in the matter.

He was kind to the "Everglade interests" when he took the scientific information which the people had paid for away from them and turned all the home-seeker inquirers of this country over to the tender mercy of the land sharks of Florida.

In his testimony he says we should always be kind to young men, but he sanctioned the contemptible outrage of the persecution and discharge of Morehouse. He was kind to the big land speculator Hall, of Colorado Springs; he was kind to Senator FLETCHER when he asked him to suppress the circular; he was kind to the trustees of the Internal-Improvement fund of Florida when they asked him for an excerpt of the report; but he was not kind to the people of this country when they asked him for the information which the department had gathered.

Mr. Chairman, like the pest of Sinbad the Sailor, this old man sits astride the shoulders of the people's rights, weighing down justice, obstructing the operation of laws intended to protect the people, and uncertain in his course of management of the expenditure of over sixteen millions annually of the people's money, he shifts from one decision to another at the beck and call particularly of the big interests of this country.

I say to you that Secretary Wilson, in spite of what he may have done, is to-day a veritable barnacle on the side of the ship of state.

In private business men of advanced years voluntarily retire from active conduct of business affairs, actuated by self-interest and chance of self-harm that may come from mismanagement. But the Secretary seems not amenable to this sound reasoning in Government business.

Mismanagement does not harm him. He can stick until he is 100 years old, and it does not harm him; but it does harm the people of the United States, and I say that department smells to high heaven, and some strong, Herculean arm ought to reach down and clean it out. [Applause on the Democratic side.]

Mr. MOON of Tennessee. Does the gentleman from Massachusetts desire to use any time?

Mr. WEEKS. I do not care to use any time, but I should like to make one suggestion to the gentleman who has just taken his seat.

Mr. BATHRICK. All right, sir.

Mr. WEEKS. I do not think it makes any difference whether Secretary Wilson is 82 or 75, but I notice the Congressional Directory says he is 77 years old.

Mr. BATHRICK. I am very glad to hear that, and thank the gentleman for the correction. I do not think it makes any difference either, as regards the conduct of the department, the way he is managing it.

Mr. MOON of Tennessee. Mr. Chairman, I yield one hour to the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. WITHERSPOON]. [Applause.]

Mr. WITHERSPOON. Mr. Chairman, I desire to call the attention of the committee to that part of the bill which relates to the parcel post.

The existing law provides for a very limited parcel post, in which the weight limit is 4 pounds and the postage rate is 16 cents a pound. The pending bill raises that weight limit to 11 pounds and reduces the rate of postage from 16 cents to 12 cents a pound. It also adds a rural parcel post, by which, for the rates therein named and within the limit of 11 pounds, parcels of merchandise may be carried from any point to any other point on a rural route but not beyond.

These changes in the proposed law raise several very interesting and to me very difficult questions. Whether the weight limit should be more or less than 11 pounds, whether the rate of postage should be the same for all distances or graded, whether the rate of postage should be more or less than 12 cents a pound, and whether the rural parcel post should be so connected with the mail as to limit the carriage and delivery of parcels received on the rural route to points on the same route, or so as to provide for their carriage and delivery at any point within the United States, are some of the questions which have excited the deepest interest and developed the most radical differences of opinion.

On the one hand, the advocates of this measure claim that if these questions are answered in accordance with their views, and the terms of the law made accordingly, it will solve all of our industrial troubles and insure universal prosperity.

Some people who do not even profess to understand the parcel post claim that it will do a great deal of good. One witness before the Post Office Committee stated that he and a large number of citizens he represented did not understand the parcel post and did not see how it was going to benefit them, but still he said it was very clear in their minds that it would do a great deal of good and that they all wanted it.

On the other hand, the opponents of the measure vehemently protest against any sort of parcel post, without any reference to the weight limit or the rate of postage, and ignoring the fact that we now have a limited parcel post, they declare that the very worst consequences will result from its maintenance. They denounce the carrying of parcels of merchandise through the mail as populist and socialistic, and almost in the same breath they tell us that it is a scheme to concentrate the wealth of the country in a few urban centers and to promote the fortunes of the great mail-order houses in the large cities. However, no one has yet explained the logical connection between populism and socialism on the one hand and the concentration of wealth and enrichment of Montgomery Ward & Co. and Sears, Roebuck & Co. on the other. But they confidently foretell that the establishment and maintenance of a parcel post will ruin and drive out of business the country merchant, will dispense with the services of 600,000 traveling men, and leave the poor farmer a helpless victim at the mercy of the great catalogue houses of the large cities.

Among all these objections it is strange that not a word of complaint can be heard from the great express companies, who are really the persons and the only persons to be injured and put out of business. This leads one to suspect that in some way the arguments of these threatened corporations have

found expression in the writings, the speeches, and the testimony of others who have been led to believe that they and not the express companies will be the victims of the parcel post.

The separation of the people into two such classes, marked by such radical and violent differences of opinion, makes it plain that nothing less than a solution absolutely correct will give popular satisfaction and that no ineffective compromise, however plausible, will be acceptable.

In order to ascertain the truth of the questions presented and to discover the correct solution of the problem, it seems to me necessary that we should consider the elements of those conditions on which the proposed law is to operate and to inquire how and to what extent we may expect bad or good results.

Now, the question of a parcel post manifestly relates to the subject of transportation, and the chief function of transportation is the interchange and distribution among the people of the products of the farm and the factory. On the one hand, we have the annual crops of American wealth, consisting of 3,000,000,000 bushels of corn, more than half a billion bushels of wheat, 16,000,000 bales of cotton, and other vegetable and animal wealth aggregating in value the sum of \$9,000,000,000. The magnitude of this annual production of agricultural wealth is too great for any accurate mental measurement, and for want of a more precise conception its greatness may be compared to those great mountains which, marking the western border of the continent, look down with wonder and pride upon that great valley in which this marvelous wealth is produced.

On the other hand, we have our manufactures, issuing from thousands of factories, consisting of almost every article fit for human use, and amounting in the aggregate to the value of \$16,000,000,000 per annum. The minds which plan and direct the creation of all this wealth can hardly conceive its extent, and, in order to portray and emphasize its magnitude, I will compare it also to that great mountain range which skirts the eastern border of the continent from Canada to the far South and pillows its huge head upon the clouds while it listens to the music of the machinery hum and the industrial songs of American factories. [Applause.]

Now, the transportation of these products of the farms and the factory to the points of their consumption and their distribution among the people is the work of commerce. The aim of every steamboat, railroad company, of the banker, and the merchant, and of all others engaged in commerce is to effect this interchange and distribution.

The freights, discounts, dividends, profits, amounting to billions of dollars, constitute the price which agriculture and manufactures pay to commerce for its services in the distribution of their products. The production of all this wealth and its interchange and distribution is the business of the world, and the most important function of commerce is that of transportation. Without transportation there can be practically no production of wealth, for it is inconceivable that the farmer can till his land and make his product, his crops, without many articles that must come from the factory. Nor can any factory operate for a day without the products of the farm. And even if without transportation we could conceive of the existence of these vast products of the farm and factory, which I have already described, yet if each farmer had to use on his farm all that he produces, and if he could not dispose of the surplus that he does not need, and if no factory could use its products except to supply the wants of those who operate that factory, business would be paralyzed and civilized life would cease. If the surplus products of the farm and the factory could not be transported to the points of their consumption, stagnation and ruin would be the result. The absolute necessity, therefore, for the transportation of the entire surplus of the products of the farm and factory can not be denied; and if the inability or failure to transport and distribute the entire surplus products of the farm and the factory would mean complete business ruin, then it follows necessarily that the failure or inability to transport any part of this surplus product of the factory and the farm is, pro tanto, a public detriment, and in the truth of that proposition lies the necessity for a parcel post [applause], for without it a large part of American wealth must be wasted, because it can not be distributed.

The transportation problem has been committed mostly to the express and railroad companies and those corporations interested only in the profits of the business have signally failed to solve the problem, and that failure creates the necessity that the Government should take action through a parcel post.

All merchandise, so far as it is the subject of transportation, may be divided into two classes. The first class consists of large quantities and is produced, bought, and sold by wholesale and transported as freight in carload lots, or at least in lots whose

weight exceeds 100 pounds. This class of merchandise is the subject of trade among the wealthier classes and, amounting to more than a billion tons per annum, it is conveyed as freight from the points of production to the centers of trade throughout the country, whence it finds its way on wagons to the country merchant.

The other class consists of small quantities produced mostly by farmers of small capital, doing a small business, and called parcels. While the first class amounts to more than a billion tons per annum, the amount of this second class seems to be unknown and can not be accurately estimated, except that it must exceed four and a half million tons a year, which, I believe, is the weight of that portion that is handled by the express companies. Between these two classes of merchandise there is an unjust and a flagrant discrimination in rates by the railroad and express companies in favor of the rich and against the poor, on account of which discrimination the transportation of this class of merchandise is either prohibited or reduced to a minimum, and this discrimination is the joint act of the railroad company and the express company. According to the regulations of the railroad companies they charge the same freight on all parcels of merchandise shipped as freight that do not exceed in weight 100 pounds, so that the shipment of 10 pounds of freight pays just 10 times as high a rate per pound as a shipment of 100 pounds or more. This discrimination debars small shipments of merchandise from being transported as freight and drives them into the express.

But we find that the express company and the railroad company have entered into a contract by which the express company has bound itself never to charge less than 150 per cent of the rate charged by the railroad company on shipments of the same goods in larger quantities, and in actual practice the express company collects from the people more than 16 times as high a rate on the shipment of merchandise in small parcels as the railroad company collects on the same goods shipped in larger quantities. The express company makes no charge less than 25 cents, so that if your parcel is worth only 25 cents, you must pay the full value of it in order to have it transported; and on all parcels destined to go a long distance the express rates are so high as to be prohibitive. These discriminations make it impossible for any merchandise bought and transported in small quantities to be sold in competition with merchandise bought and transported in carload lots, and either prohibits the importation of these parcels or reduces them to a minimum, down to where the condition of the shipper is such that the rate is immaterial to him. Now, this discrimination against the small parcel and this prohibition against the transportation of merchandise in small quantities is a fact, or one of the facts, which not only justifies but necessitates a parcel post by the Government, and if this discrimination against the small parcels, if this prohibition against the transportation of parcels of merchandise weighing less than 100 pounds, is the evil to be remedied, then the remedy should be coextensive with the evil and the weight limit should be raised not from 4 to 11 pounds as provided in this bill, but from 4 to 100 pounds as demanded by the very conditions which call for any parcel post at all. [Applause.]

This discrimination either exists or it does not exist. If it does not exist, if the railroad and express companies do now carry merchandise in small parcels at reasonable rates and without any discrimination, if they do that, then there is no excuse for any parcel post at all, and the weight limit should not only not be raised from 4 to 11 pounds, but the law with reference to any parcels at all should be repealed. But if this discrimination does exist, if the railroad and express rates on merchandise shipped in small parcels is so high and exorbitant as to consume all the profits of the production of such merchandise, then the Government in providing a parcel post should fix the weight limit so as to embrace all parcels that can not profitably be sent by rail or express, and this applies as forcibly to the 100-pound parcel as it does to the 11-pound parcel. There is no reason that I can see why parcels weighing 11 pounds and under should be received in the mails and those weighing 11 pounds and over should be excluded. If the Government undertakes the business of carrying parcels on the ground that the railroad and express companies have failed to handle the business satisfactorily, then manifestly in logic it must provide for the handling of all parcels which those corporations have failed to handle satisfactorily, and that includes 100 pounds just as well as it does 11 pounds. And so I submit that the—

Mr. MOON of Tennessee. May I ask the gentleman a question?

Mr. WITHERSPOON. Yes.

Mr. MOON of Tennessee. Does that include the 250-pound parcel as well as the 100?



Mr. WITHERSPOON. No, sir.

Mr. MOON of Tennessee. Why not?

Mr. WITHERSPOON. For the very reason I have already explained. I do not understand there is any discrimination by the railroad company against the 250-pound parcel.

Mr. MOON of Tennessee. Do I understand the gentleman to mean that the definite point of discrimination is at 100 pounds?

Mr. WITHERSPOON. I understand that that is the regulation of the railroad company and that it draws a distinction in rates between 100 pounds and over. Now, the second reason—

Mr. WILLIS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield at that point?

Mr. WITHERSPOON. I will.

Mr. WILLIS. I am very much interested in the gentleman's scholarly presentation of this subject, and I would like to know the gentleman's plan for carrying this into effect. Would it be by taking it from the express companies—or perhaps the gentleman is coming to that?

Mr. WITHERSPOON. I will get to that after awhile. I can not discuss but one thing at a time. Now, the second argument I want to present to the committee is that the parcel post should be established because the railroads and express companies do not even pretend to extend the benefits of the service of transportation to the rural population. The fact is these corporations have never recognized the existence of the country at all, but they confine all their efforts and activities to the people living in the towns and cities. I submit that the country people have the same right and should have the same opportunity to have the products of their labor transported to the point of consumption as the people in the towns and cities, but this right has never been taken into consideration in the solution of the transportation problem. The farmer must transport in the best way he can the produce of his farm to some trading center before the railroad company and the express company will touch it. Now, as to corn, cotton, wheat, and other articles that are produced in large quantities and are bulky, the farmer can transport them to market as cheaply, perhaps more cheaply, than the Government can do it for him, and therefore he is not damaged by the failure of these corporations to take such articles at his farm; but on every farm there are numerous products, such as eggs, fowls, vegetables, and fruits, which are produced on such a small scale that after satisfying the wants of the farmer's family the surplus left is so small that the farmer can not afford to transport them to the market, and hence they are wasted.

Now, if the farmer knew that ample means were provided for the transportation of such merchandise to market at a reasonable price it would stimulate and increase the production of this kind of wealth, which could always be done without additional capital by utilizing labor which otherwise would be idle, and thus the wealth of the country would be increased. These by-products of the farm would often constitute and measure the farmer's profit and at the same time satisfy the wants and decrease the cost of living to the people in the town.

Mr. BLACKMON. Mr. Chairman—

The CHAIRMAN. Will the gentleman from Mississippi yield?

Mr. WITHERSPOON. Yes, sir.

Mr. BLACKMON. Is it the gentleman's idea of parcel post that it will be required to carry poultry and eggs?

Mr. WITHERSPOON. Oh, yes. I do not care to discuss that.

Mr. BLACKMON. I want to ask you a question.

Mr. WITHERSPOON. I want to discuss what I consider are the principles involved in this question.

Mr. BLACKMON. The gentleman declines to yield to my question?

Mr. WITHERSPOON. I have yielded to your question.

Mr. BLACKMON. Are you in favor of a parcel post that would take a hundred pounds of poultry or of eggs through the mails with the facilities we now have?

Mr. WITHERSPOON. I will answer the gentleman's question and say yes; and anything else that is good for the consumer in the city and that will give a profit to the farmer by benefiting the country. That is what I want.

Mr. BLACKMON. I would just like to ask another question. Is the gentleman in favor of maintaining a rural route such as we now have?

Mr. WITHERSPOON. Why, certainly I am.

Mr. BLACKMON. And do you think with a provision of the kind you suggest you can maintain the present rural routes and extend other rural routes?

Mr. WITHERSPOON. I think so. That is a question on which I am not an expert, and I did not propose to enlighten this committee on that. I just wanted to discuss certain general principles that I think underlie what would be a proper

parcel post. I was discussing the failure of the railroad and express companies to afford any facilities for the rural population. The fact that they do not recognize the possibility of this great increase in the production of wealth and provide for its transportation shows that the railroad and express business of the country is founded in ignorance of or indifference to the needs of the rural population, amounting to 40,000,000 people, and that very failure is one of the facts that I think necessitates a parcel post, and if their failure to provide for the transportation to market of this class of merchandise produced on the farm is the necessity for a parcel post, then manifestly that necessity embraces parcels of 100 pounds just as much as it embraces parcels of 11 pounds. If the inability or failure of the transportation companies to take care of the agricultural products existing in such small quantities that the farmer can not afford to carry them to market necessitates a parcel post, then manifestly the very necessity or reason why parcels of 11 pounds or under should be carried in the mails would apply with equal force to parcels weighing more than 11 pounds up to the point when the farmer could afford to provide his own transportation, which would be not less than 100 pounds, for it would be an economic waste for him to devote his own time and his wagon and team to the transportation to market of less than a load. In this second reason or necessity for a parcel post there is nothing that makes 11 pounds a reasonable limit to the admission and exclusion of parcels from the mails.

The third reason I submit to the committee why a parcel post should be now established, and that it should include parcels of 100 pounds, is that the Government is now the only one that can conduct that business at a profit. Having taken up the parcels business so far as all those parcels that are embraced in what is known as the first, second, and third class mail are concerned, which, on account of their bulk, their size and weight, and high relative value, are the most profitable part of the business, the Government has rendered it impossible for any private person to conduct the business of transporting other classes of parcels at a profit. While the Government has made it impossible for anyone else to conduct this business profitably, the facilities already provided by the Government for the transportation of parcels embraced in the first three classes of mail will enable the Government to transport parcels of merchandise in many cases without any increase in the cost, and in no case with a proportionate increase in the cost.

Now, to illustrate: When the Government has provided a mail car on the train or a wagon on a rural route and that car or wagon is half filled with mail of the first, second, and third classes, manifestly it would cost absolutely nothing more to fill up the car or the wagon with parcels of merchandise. And in all those cases where the carriage of parcels of merchandise would necessitate procuring more space in the car or procuring a larger wagon, or an additional animal to draw the wagon, the increase in the cost would not be proportional to the increase in the revenue. So that, the Government having taken charge of so much of the parcel-transportation business as yields in revenue \$237,000,000 per annum and rendered it impossible for anyone else to conduct this business profitably, and having already incurred a large part, if not the principal part, of the cost necessary and incident to the conduct of the business, there is an imperative demand that it should carry for the people their parcels of merchandise. [Applause.]

Mr. MOON of Tennessee. May I ask the gentleman a question or two there?

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman yield?

Mr. WITHERSPOON. I yield to the gentleman from Tennessee.

Mr. MOON of Tennessee. You know the Government now carries at a very great loss second-class mail matter?

Mr. WITHERSPOON. I do not know that.

Mr. MOON of Tennessee. Well, the department thinks it does.

Mr. WITHERSPOON. Yes; and I think the department does not know what it is talking about when it says so.

Mr. MOON of Tennessee. That may be, but the best statisticians and experts in the United States who have passed upon it think so. Whether it is so or not, I am not able to say; but I am assuming that it is so from the evidence that is before the committee and the country. I just wanted to ask the gentleman a question leading to that. At what figure does the gentleman think we could afford to carry fourth-class mail matter and not incur a loss in its carriage?

Mr. WITHERSPOON. I beg the gentleman's pardon. I am coming to that directly. I am discussing a different thing right now. If anybody has a question to ask, I would prefer that he ask it about what I am discussing, and if he wishes to ask about some other matter I would prefer that he wait until I

get to that. I can not mix up things. I am now discussing another matter.

The Government having rendered it impossible for another to carry on the business, having taken over that portion of the parcel-transportation business which yields in revenue to the Government \$237,000,000 in a year, and the most profitable part of it, and therefore having made it impossible for any private enterprise to conduct the business, I say the demand that the Government should do it all is now imperative.

Mr. MOON of Tennessee. Does the gentleman mean to say that the Government has taken over all the matter over 4 pounds in weight?

Mr. WITHERSPOON. No, sir. I said all the parcel business; and what I mean by parcel business is periodicals and newspapers and books and all other things constituting the first, second, and third classes of mail matter, because they are nothing but parcels.

Mr. MOON of Tennessee. But it is the fourth-class matter that we now have under discussion.

Mr. WITHERSPOON. I know; but the Government has taken the other parcels, and I now say it should take them all; it ought to take them all.

Mr. WEEKS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman from Mississippi yield to the gentleman from Massachusetts?

Mr. WITHERSPOON. Yes.

Mr. WEEKS. Does not the gentleman know that the express companies carry a large amount of what would otherwise be second-class mail—papers and periodicals?

Mr. WITHERSPOON. That is my information; and if that is true, they do it in violation of the law, in my estimation.

Mr. WEEKS. Some of the large publishing companies transport the bulk of their publications in that way.

Mr. WITHERSPOON. I understand; and I say it is in violation of the law, and they ought to be stopped from doing it.

Having created the necessity that it should carry parcels of merchandise, the necessity exists as to parcels exceeding 11 pounds in weight just the same as to parcels of less weight. Indeed, when the Government undertakes to carry parcels weighing as much as 11 pounds, as proposed in the bill, then the necessity for its carriage of all parcels up to 100 pounds in weight becomes imperative, because the impossibility of a private person or corporation handling parcels which exceed 11 pounds in weight, while the Government takes all parcels up to 11 pounds, is manifest. No good reason can be given why the mails should be open to parcels of 11 pounds and closed to those of greater weight. If the fact that the Government alone can profitably conduct the transportation of parcels demands the parcel post, then the demand embraces all parcels up to 100 pounds.

Now, resuming, whether you regard this discrimination against the small parcel or this failure of the express and railroad companies to extend their services to the rural population or the fact that the Government alone can now profitably carry on this business; whether you regard any one of these, or all of them combined, as the reason or the necessity for a parcel post, I say that there is nothing in any one of these reasons, nor is there anything in all three of them combined, that gives any sort of support to the distinction made by this bill that the Government should receive parcels weighing as much as 11 pounds and should not receive any weighing over 11 pounds.

I desire now to call the attention of the committee to the question whether or not the postage rate on parcels should be the same for all distances, or should be graded. This bill proposes a flat rate. According to the provisions of the bill a parcel can be carried for the same postage, whether it is to go 10 miles or 4,000 miles. In thus adopting a flat rate, I submit that the committee is clearly right, and I hope they will be sustained, for several reasons.

The first reason is that the flat rate is the one generally adopted in foreign countries, where the parcel post has been in existence for many years, and the experience of those countries, in which, after many years' trial, no one has ever found any reason why the flat rate should be abandoned, is a reasonable assurance of its value. It is also in line with our own policy with regard to the first, second, and third classes of mail and in regard to the 4-pound parcel, which we have provided for heretofore. All of these can be carried any distance for the same amount of postage.

The flat rate is also in line with the contract made between the United Kingdom and the American Express Co., by which that express company carries all parcels coming to this country from England to any point in the United States at the same charge, without regard to the distance it has traveled. Now, a

long-standing policy should never be abandoned unless very cogent reasons can be given to show its unsoundness.

Mr. LAFFERTY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield at that point for a question?

Mr. WITHERSPOON. Certainly.

Mr. LAFFERTY. Is it not a fact that in these foreign countries the weight limit is 11 pounds?

Mr. WITHERSPOON. Oh, no; that is not the fact at all.

Mr. LAFFERTY. What is the weight limit?

Mr. WITHERSPOON. It varies. In some countries it is 11 pounds, in some 22 pounds, in some 100 pounds, and in some 110 pounds.

Mr. LAFFERTY. If the weight should be fixed at 100 pounds in this country, at a flat rate from coast to coast, is it not probable that the manufacturers of flour and shingles on the Pacific coast would put up their products in 100-pound packages and send them through the mails?

Mr. WITHERSPOON. Would it be probable?

Mr. LAFFERTY. Yes; at a flat rate.

Mr. WITHERSPOON. I think it would be impossible.

Mr. LAFFERTY. Why?

Mr. WITHERSPOON. Because they would have to compete with the railroad companies as freight, and we can never make the rate on parcels such that you could compete with the railroad companies.

Mr. LAFFERTY. I am in favor of a parcel post, but I want one that will be practicable.

Mr. WITHERSPOON. So do I. If I wanted one that was impracticable I would not want one at all, because I do not see how you can have any other kind except a practicable one; but they have them in other countries, where they carry more than 110 pounds, and I submit that whatever people in any other country on earth can do we can do also. [Applause.]

The second reason why I favor a flat rate is that it is the most simple and inexpensive method. If you want to make a success of the parcel post one of the most important things you can do is to have it as simple and inexpensive as possible. Those who at heart do not want it would like to have you make it so expensive that it would break itself down. Those who really want it and would like to see it succeed should contend that it be as simple and as inexpensive as possible.

With the flat rate the only trouble and expense in determining the correct amount of postage is to weigh the parcel; and whether this trouble and expense be incurred by the sender of the parcel or by the postmaster, or by both, it reduces the expense, so far as the determination of the correct amount of postage is concerned, to a minimum; but if the postage rate is to be graded according to distance, it is almost inconceivable how you are ever going to find out how much postage to put on your parcel.

The expense of ascertaining how far it is from Boston, Ga., to Kalamazoo, Mich., will be such that most people would throw their parcels away rather than go to the trouble of finding how much the postage ought to be. You have got not only to weigh your parcel, but you have got to go and get some map, or some way to calculate the distance; and then when you get the distance your parcel has to go and the weight of it, if you have studied arithmetic, you may be able to sit down and work out how much your postage is.

The graded rate would not only result frequently in great confusion as to the correct amount of postage, but the cost of ascertaining it would often exceed the postage.

Mr. MOON of Tennessee. I believe the gentleman is speaking on the question of rates.

Mr. WITHERSPOON. Yes.

Mr. MOON of Tennessee. Will the gentleman answer my question, what the rate of postage ought to be per pound, on a flat rate?

Mr. WITHERSPOON. I intended to answer the gentleman fully when I began to discuss the question of how high the rates ought to be. Since the gentleman has asked the question twice, though, I will pause here to say that I do not believe any human being knows or can know, and I do not believe any commission you can ever appoint will find out exactly how much the postage rate ought to be. It is utterly impossible to do it. But my suggestion would be that the most sensible thing to do would be to try it on that rate that was adopted and proved satisfactory in England, and if it turns out to be too high we can reduce it. If it turns out to be too low, we can raise it.

Mr. SMITH of Michigan and Mr. MOON of Tennessee. What was that rate?

Mr. WITHERSPOON. That rate as I remember it is 6 cents for a parcel weighing 1 pound, and then the rate decreases as the weight increases, up to 11 pounds, and the postage on an 11-pound parcel is 2 cents a pound.



Mr. MOON of Tennessee. What is the average length of haul in Great Britain?

Mr. WITHERSPOON. I do not know what is the average length of haul.

Mr. MOON of Tennessee. It is not more than one-fifth of what it would be in the United States, is it?

Mr. WITHERSPOON. I do not think it is. I do not think that makes much difference.

Mr. MOON of Tennessee. It is estimated by the department that it costs about 6½ cents a pound to send fourth-class matter, to which you have to add the cost of handling, of course, which would probably make it more than 8 cents on their estimate. Would you think it wise to establish a rate that was less than that figure?

Mr. WITHERSPOON. If you assume all those things, I would not.

Mr. MOON of Tennessee. That is the best information we have.

Mr. WITHERSPOON. I have read that information very carefully in the hearings, but I do not think the department has the correct idea about the cost. I do not believe they know what the cost is. You can not hire a wagon and hitch a mule to it and fill it half full of stuff and then put in something else and tell me what the cost of carrying the something else is.

Mr. MOON of Tennessee. I know, but there have been two or three commissions with expert testimony before them. There have been statements of statisticians and the department information expressing the opinion from actual experience, and they all reach about the same conclusion.

Mr. WITHERSPOON. I have read all their arguments, and they do not even know how many parcels there were. They counted them years after the parcels had passed out of existence and made some kind of calculation as to cost.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. MOON of Tennessee. I will yield the gentleman half an hour more. Can the gentleman finish in that time?

Mr. WITHERSPOON. I will get through in a half an hour if I am not asked any more questions.

Mr. MOON of Tennessee. Well, we will yield the gentleman time enough to answer the questions. Now, if it is true that all of the statisticians, scientific experts, and the department that has had a good deal of experience have reached a conclusion that you say is not correct, would it be wise for us here with the limited information that this body has to throw away all of that testimony and attempt arbitrarily to fix the rate regardless of their view?

Mr. WITHERSPOON. Yes; and I will tell you why. It is a self-evident proposition that any people that can produce any kind of wealth can profitably transport that wealth to market.

Mr. MOON of Tennessee. We are talking about rates.

Mr. WITHERSPOON. Let me answer the gentleman's question. You can not tell me that a man can take enough capital to buy land and mules and plows and labor and everything of that kind, and produce agricultural wealth, and, then, that he must let it be wasted because the department here in Washington says that it can not be profitably transported. [Applause.]

Mr. MOON of Tennessee. Nobody assumes that; the question is as to the sources of information. If from all sources of information Congress has had heretofore it has not been able to obtain a figure that is correct as to the cost of transportation, what view would the gentleman take of that? Would he go along blindly and fix another rate or fix the rate agreed upon experimentally?

Mr. WITHERSPOON. Agreed upon by whom?

Mr. MOON of Tennessee. The rate that has been determined by the department.

Mr. WITHERSPOON. No, sir; I would not agree to any rate the department determined upon, because before I would do that I would oppose a parcel post. You can not have a parcel post with any 12-cents-a-pound rate. That is impossible.

Mr. MOON of Tennessee. If, as a matter of fact, assuming it to be true—I understand the gentleman does not agree to the fact, but there are those who think it is correct—that it costs the Government now to transport and handle fourth-class matter something over 8 cents, ought we to make a flat rate less than 8 cents a pound?

Mr. WITHERSPOON. No; I do not think you ought to fix it at less than the cost.

Mr. MOON of Tennessee. Does not the gentleman think we are paying too much for the transportation now when the express companies pay three-quarters of a cent a pound and they have some division between them and the railroad company which we have not been able to ascertain? Would it not be better for the Government, before it undertakes the transporta-

tion in competition with the express companies, to enforce its authority and power and make the railroad company give to the Government of the United States as low a rate of transportation as that it gives to the express company?

Mr. WITHERSPOON. No; I think it ought to be done at the same time.

Mr. MOON of Tennessee. It ought to be done to make the act effective.

Mr. WITHERSPOON. Make the railroad companies carry merchandise for the Government at the same rate for another corporation.

Mr. MOON of Tennessee. I think the gentleman is right about that.

Mr. SAMUEL W. SMITH. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WITHERSPOON. I will.

Mr. SAMUEL W. SMITH. A moment ago the gentleman spoke about the rates of England on small packages; does the gentleman remember what the rate is on 100 pounds?

Mr. WITHERSPOON. Eleven pounds is the maximum weight limit in England.

Mr. SAMUEL W. SMITH. I understand in some countries it runs up as high as 132 pounds.

Mr. WITHERSPOON. Yes.

Mr. SAMUEL W. SMITH. What is the rate on that?

Mr. WITHERSPOON. Mr. Chairman, if the gentleman will excuse me, I will give him those rates as I remember them when I come to discuss what the rate should be.

Mr. WEEKS. Mr. Chairman, before the gentleman takes up the thread of his argument will he yield for a question?

Mr. WITHERSPOON. Certainly.

Mr. WEEKS. Does the gentleman recall whether the English parcel post pays a profit or not?

Mr. WITHERSPOON. I do not recall it, and I do not think anybody else recalls it, because all of the evidence that I have read upon the subject shows that they have all their mail mixed up together just as we have ours, and that it is utterly impossible to tell whether any particular kind of mail is profitable or unprofitable. I call the gentleman's attention to a volume of 320 pages, consisting of the replies of American consuls to the Secretary of State, from all the countries of the world, and all of those consuls were asked that question and not one of them could find out in any country on earth what the cost of the parcel post part of the mail was. The only country on earth that can do it is a country that does not want any parcel post at all, and that is our country.

Mr. WEEKS. One suggestion more. We pay about \$160,000,000 a year for handling our mail. That pays the postmasters, the clerks, the carriers, the railway post-office clerks, and so forth.

Mr. WITHERSPOON. Yes.

Mr. WEEKS. That is the cost of labor for handling the mail.

Mr. WITHERSPOON. Yes.

Mr. WEEKS. In England that labor would not cost over \$100,000,000, and probably less rather than more. In other words, there is a difference of \$60,000,000. From what source is that \$60,000,000 going to be dug up if we make the same rate that they have in England?

Mr. WITHERSPOON. The gentleman and I are now getting into a domain where we can not agree.

Mr. LEWIS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman permit me to answer that question?

Mr. WITHERSPOON. Certainly.

Mr. LEWIS. The increased revenue to cover the increased expense, I may say to the gentleman from Massachusetts, is derived from the fact that the American postal employee performs nearly twice as much work as the English postal employee.

Mr. WITHERSPOON. That is just what I had in mind by saying that we could not agree about it.

Mr. WEEKS. That would be an answer, if the premise were correct, but I do not think the premise is correct, and I do not think the gentleman from Maryland has any information that would substantiate that.

Mr. LEWIS. I have very accurate information, official information.

Mr. WITHERSPOON. Mr. Chairman, I want to say to the gentleman from Massachusetts that I know very little about this subject, except what I read in the hearings, where the gentleman from Massachusetts was present and did a great deal of the questioning of the witnesses. I found printed in those hearings a statement to the effect that the postal clerks or servants in the United States handled per capita about twice as much mail as the English do. I got that information from the gentleman's own hearings, and I suppose it must be correct.

Mr. MOON of Tennessee. Mr. Chairman, I do not want to interrupt the gentleman after he gets on to his line of argument, and before he proceeds to that I desire to ask him if he can answer the question which I asked awhile ago. I simply want to get the benefit of his judgment upon it. I understand the gentleman fixed 100 pounds as the maximum limit for the parcel post. What rate would he fix on a broad flat rate per pound for the whole United States?

Mr. WITHERSPOON. Mr. Chairman, I am going to discuss that separately in a few moments, and I will then tell the gentleman what I think is the proper rate.

Mr. REILLY. Mr. Chairman, in that connection I would like the gentleman to discuss also the inadvisability or the advisability of making 1-cent-a-pound rate for fourth-class matter, even up to 100 pounds, that being the rate at which the Government now transports newspapers in bulk.

Mr. WITHERSPOON. Mr. Chairman, I will give the gentleman my views about that presently. I am now discussing a flat rate, trying to give the reasons why the principle of the flat rate is right. The first reason I have given was that it accords with our own experience and the experience of all other countries, and the second is that it is the most inexpensive and the simplest. The argument against the flat rate, as I understand it, is this: That the cost of transporting an article is proportionate to the distance it is carried, and, therefore, in justice, the owner of the article should pay in proportion to the distance it is carried. That is the argument. I submit that the fallacy of that argument lies in the assumption that there is any relation or connection between the carriage of an article and its cost. The cost of carriage is an entirely different thing from the carriage itself. The cost consists in procuring a car and an engine, a wagon, coal, oil, and the necessary labor and skill to propel the wagon or car from point to point. That is the cost of the carriage, and that is just identically the same whether the mail car in the one case or the wagon in the other is empty, half filled, or full of parcels. The cost incident to the weight of the parcels is negligible, and is not made appreciable by the distance it is carried. The carriage of the parcel is neither the cause nor the measure of the cost.

The distance the parcel is carried is the measure of the benefit to its owner, and that cost should never be so high as to consume all the profit that is in the article transported on the false assumption that the carriage of the article is either the cause or the measure of the cost.

Mr. BLACKMON. Will the gentleman yield for just one question?

Mr. WITHERSPOON. Assuredly.

Mr. BLACKMON. The gentleman says he does not think the distance increases the cost of carrying the article.

Mr. WITHERSPOON. No; I do not think it has anything to do with it.

Mr. BLACKMON. The gentleman thinks that a railroad company could carry a package from Washington to, say, Charlotte, N. C., as cheaply as to Birmingham, Ala.?

Mr. WITHERSPOON. Yes; and it would be just as cheap if they did not carry it at all. If you get on the Southern Railway here and let it take you to Charlottesville, you could not with a microscope tell any difference in the cost, whether you had a parcel in there or not.

Mr. BLACKMON. I thought the gentleman said that coal, labor, and other things entered into it?

Mr. WITHERSPOON. The gentleman did not understand me. I say when you have got your engine and your cars and your railroad tracks and your coal and your oil and your labor and your skill you have incurred all the cost then, and it does not increase it or diminish it or affect it whether you go with an empty train or whether you put a parcel in it. That is what I said.

Mr. BLACKMON. You burn more oil and more coal between the points I mentioned.

Mr. WITHERSPOON. I did not hear the gentleman.

Mr. BLACKMON. I say you burn more oil and coal between the points I mentioned.

Mr. WITHERSPOON. Yes; but the parcel did not make you burn any more than you would have burned if you did not have any parcel in there.

Mr. BLACKMON. Suppose the tracks terminated, say, in North Carolina and the train stopped there and you had three or four other packages to carry a longer distance?

Mr. WITHERSPOON. The gentleman is supposing a case that can not exist. You have got your railroad tracks and your trains already running all over this country. They run from Boston to San Francisco. The cost is already incurred, and you

are supposing a case that does not exist when you say that it stops at a certain place.

Mr. BLACKMON. Is not the gentleman's presumption very violent when he makes that statement that the cost of the short distance is as much as for the long distance?

Mr. WITHERSPOON. Well, you asked me to pass an opinion upon my own views, and I gave my views honestly. That is what I think.

Mr. HENSLEY. May I ask the gentleman a question?

Mr. WITHERSPOON. Certainly.

Mr. HENSLEY. Would the gentleman apply that same principle to carrying passengers?

Mr. WITHERSPOON. Well, I am not on the passenger problem now.

Mr. HENSLEY. That is true, but I want—

Mr. WITHERSPOON. Let us cross that bridge when we get to it.

Mr. HENSLEY. I am afraid that we will not get to it in this connection, and I would like to have the gentleman's opinion.

Mr. WITHERSPOON. Well, whether or not the Government will force the railroad companies, in their dealings with the people on the transportation of both persons and freight to-day, to do the same thing that the Government itself is going to do, or ought to be done by this Government, is a question that it will be time enough to discuss when we come to it. I have not time enough to discuss it to-night anyway, as I have too many other things. Now, I want to submit this about the injustice of the flat rate. I was discussing the argument that the flat rate is unjust; that you ought to make a man pay according to the distance his parcel is carried.

Now, even in these few countries where the fallacy of this injustice argument is not perceived and where, in order to avoid what they call injustice, those countries adopt what is called the zone system, by which they divide the country up into zones and charge the same rate for all parcels in a certain zone, that very zone system is a confession of the utter impracticability of grading the postage on parcels according to distance, because there we have the flat rate for every zone, and it is just as unjust to have that flat rate in one zone as it is to have it in another. Now, say we have our country divided up into zones. We will say it is 4,000 miles across and that we have eight zones of 500 miles each. Well, the proposition is to have the same rate for all parcels that go within the distance of 500 miles. In other words, if we send that parcel 1 mile, according to the zone system you charge the same postage as if you send it 500 miles in the zone system, and therefore on that supposition the injustice is just 500 times as great in one case as in the other. So I say there is absolutely nothing in this objection to the flat rate.

Now, one other argument in favor of the flat rate and—

Mr. LLOYD. May I ask the gentleman in that connection how would he compete with the express company?

Mr. WITHERSPOON. I would not compete with the express company at all; I would destroy the express company.

Mr. LLOYD. Entirely destroy it?

Mr. WITHERSPOON. Yes; I am coming to that later. I am going on the assumption that we will not have any express companies.

I say the other argument is an economic one, and that is this, that the flat rate would put every community in the United States on the same footing as to the sale of all of its products and as to the purchase of everything it needs. To illustrate, any community in California that had a surplus of vegetables or fruit would have every community in the United States as far as Maine in which to sell its surplus products, and it would not be excluded from any community on account of a difference in transportation. And on the other hand every community in the United States that needed to buy anything would have every other community as a market and could select the cheapest and best one, and would not be shut out of any of them on account of a difference in transportation. Thus we would, by a flat rate of postage, have the greatest amount of competition in the sale and purchase of merchandise in small parcels, and I submit that in this age of monopolies and trusts, this age where the will of the trust has been substituted for the laws of trade and the high cost of living fixed by the whim of the commercial tyrant, no consideration or argument ought to receive more weight than one which proposes the restoration of competition in trade. So that the flat rate is supported by our experience and the experience of foreign countries. It is the most simple and inexpensive plan, and it proposes the greatest amount of competition, and for those three reasons I hope that the bill, so far as it fixes a flat rate, will be sustained by the committee.



Now, in regard to the rate of postage, the bill provides it shall be 12 cents a pound, which is a reduction of 4 cents from the rate now existing, but, in my judgment, is entirely too high. The very object of a parcel post is to provide a method by which the people can have their parcels of merchandise transported, and if you fix the rate so high as to take all the profits out of it you defeat the very object of the law. There are a great many kinds of merchandise where the weight is so great in proportion to the value of it that a rate of 12 cents a pound would be simply prohibitive.

If an article is worth 12 cents a pound, then under this bill you must pay the full value of the article to have it transported. If the article is worth 24 cents a pound, then you must pay 50 per cent of the value of the article to have it transported. No article worth less than \$1.32 a pound could be transported under this bill without paying as much as 10 per cent of its value.

I submit that the object of a parcel post is to do some business, and that it should be so framed and the rate should be so fixed as to move the traffic. That is to say, the rate should be such that it will not consume all the profit in the production of the article. Now, that being so, any rate which would be 100 per cent of the value of the article, or 50 per cent, or 25 per cent, or even 10 per cent, would be absolutely prohibitive, and really be a mockery to the people in pretending to give them a parcel post when there really was none. To my mind such a rate would be prohibitive as to a large proportion—perhaps half—of the merchandise that would otherwise be sent through the mails, and would confine the use of the mails largely to such parcels as the situation of the sender would induce him to send without regard to the cost. If the expense of maintaining a parcel post is to be sustained, then the rate should be such as to move the traffic; in other words, it should be such as to enable every producer of wealth, whether on the farm, in the factory, or elsewhere, to have it transported to any point when needed at such a cost as not to consume all the profits of its production. The very foundation of this parcel-post movement is the exorbitant rates of the express company. If it had not been for that, I do not expect we would have heard of a parcel post. The express companies collect from the people about 10 times as much as the freight rate, and it is against that exorbitant rate of the express companies that we statesmen are going to relieve the people, and yet we have got in this bill a rate that is 8 times as high as the rate of the express companies. That is how we are going to relieve the people.

Now, this rate seems to be unreasonably high in comparison with the rates in other countries. As I said before, in England the rate is 6 cents for the first pound, and then the rate decreases as the weight increases, until you get it up to 11 pounds, where the rate is 2 cents a pound. That is the increased rate. So that this bill proposes that for a parcel of 1 pound the English rate would be just half of what ours is, and for a parcel of 11 pounds the English charge would be one-sixth of ours. I submit that we ought not to establish a parcel post and have a rate six times as great as the English have.

Mr. SAMUEL W. SMITH. Right there may I ask the gentleman a question?

Mr. WITHERSPOON. Certainly.

Mr. SAMUEL W. SMITH. Do you think that the size of the country, in comparison with the United States, where we would have to make these changes, would make any difference in the comparison?

Mr. WITHERSPOON. Not at all. I do not think that would make any difference at all. In France, I think, the rate is 22 cents for a 29-pound parcel. It is a little less, I think, than a cent a pound, and we propose by this bill to have a rate more than 12 times as great as the French have. In Germany, where they have a zone system—

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has again expired.

Mr. MOON of Tennessee. Does the gentleman desire more time?

Mr. SAMUEL W. SMITH. I would like to ask the gentleman a question or two myself.

Mr. WITHERSPOON. I would like to have about 15 minutes.

Mr. MOON of Tennessee. Mr. Chairman, I yield to the gentleman 30 minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Mississippi is recognized for 30 minutes more.

Mr. WITHERSPOON. In Germany, where they have the zone system, my recollection is that the rate on a parcel weighing less than 11 pounds, if it is to be carried less than 46 miles, is about half a cent a pound, and if it is to be carried farther

than 46 miles it is about a cent a pound. If it is a parcel that weighs more than 11 pounds, then the increase in postage is about a cent for each zone.

Mr. MOON of Tennessee. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman permit me?

Mr. WITHERSPOON. Certainly.

Mr. MOON of Tennessee. Does the gentleman know whether the Government owns the railroads there or not?

Mr. WITHERSPOON. In Germany?

Mr. MOON of Tennessee. Yes.

Mr. WITHERSPOON. My recollection is that it does not. I do not believe it does.

Mr. MOON of Tennessee. It does own some of them. Does the gentleman recollect what the railroad companies charge the Government where the Government does not own the railroads?

Mr. WITHERSPOON. Well, I can not give you the rates of all the countries, but I do not think you can find a country on earth where there is any rate which bears the remotest resemblance in magnitude to the rate in this bill; not a one.

Mr. MOON of Tennessee. Can the gentleman find a foreign country where the railroad companies charge the Government so much as they do here?

Mr. WITHERSPOON. I do not think it makes any difference what the railroads charge. I think it is the business of this Government to make the railroads do right.

Mr. MOON of Tennessee. I think the gentleman is right about that, but he is doubling the question. We have not made the railroads do right yet.

Mr. WITHERSPOON. It is our business to make them do right. That is what we are here in Congress for.

Mr. MOON of Tennessee. You will hardly be able to do it in this bill, I reckon.

Mr. POST. While the gentleman is discussing the rates adopted by the European countries for parcel post, what effect did the parcel post have upon the European shopkeepers in the small towns?

Mr. WITHERSPOON. Well, my friend is getting at something that is at the end of my speech. I will take that up before I close. I was discussing the rate in Germany. If we consider the rates in England, France, and Germany we would be forced to the conclusion that the lawmakers that passed the parcel-post law in those countries intended that the people should use the parcel post to carry their parcels. But when you consider the rate proposed in this bill, the wildest imagination can not picture what sort of a parcel will ever pass through our mail with 12 cents on every pound.

Mr. JOHNSON of South Carolina. That is \$240 a ton.

Mr. SAMUEL W. SMITH. Before the gentleman leaves that question of rates, does he know what those countries charge for carrying 100 pounds or 132 pounds?

Mr. WITHERSPOON. I have just given those rates.

Mr. SAMUEL W. SMITH. The gentleman gave them for England.

Mr. WITHERSPOON. England has a limit of 11 pounds.

Mr. SAMUEL W. SMITH. Take any country that has got a rate for 100 or 120 pounds.

Mr. WITHERSPOON. I think Germany has a limit of 100 pounds.

Mr. SAMUEL W. SMITH. What was the rate there?

Mr. WITHERSPOON. It was what I stated a moment ago. I gave the German rates. The only distinction in pounds was that a certain weight of less than 11 pounds, and a slight increase of less than 1 cent for each zone if the parcel weighs more than 11 pounds up to the limit, which I think is about 100 pounds.

Mr. REILLY. It is about three-quarters of a cent more at each step or zone.

Mr. WITHERSPOON. Now, if Congress should pass any such parcel post as I have advocated, especially if Congress should fix the weight limit at 100 pounds, then I submit that it follows logically that there ought to be a law prohibiting express companies from carrying mail matter. The Government is an agency or instrumentality of the people, and to my mind it is utterly intolerable that the Government should engage in any business in competition with a private person, either natural or corporate; and therefore I say that the Government should condemn, under the right of eminent domain, all the property that the express companies are using in this business and take it over and take the place of the express companies and pay them a fair price for their property.

Not only is that true upon principle, but it is also true as a matter of business. I think it is foolishness on the part of the Government and the express companies to engage in this business of transportation and divide it between them. The people are now paying the Government \$237,000,000 a year to carry some

of its parcels and are paying the express companies \$150,000,000 a year to carry other parcels.

But there seems to be a great fear that the parcel post will cause a deficit in the Post Office Department. This department of the Government is regarded by some as a mercantile establishment which is liable to sustain a loss on account of the parcel post, and this is the reason for such a high rate as 12 cents a pound. To consider the question in the light of a financial loss of the department seems to me to be a confusion of thought. The Government is but an instrumentality or agent of the people and from the nature of things can neither make a profit nor sustain a loss. If it renders the people a service, as in the carriage of parcels, it matters not how the people pay for that service, whether in stamps or other taxes, there can be no loss if the value of the service is equal to the price paid. Whatever rate is adopted can be increased by Congress if it should result in making the revenues of the department less than the expenditures. This test can not be made with a high rate of postage which will inhibit a large proportion of parcels from the mails and then deprive this department of its legitimate revenues. And I submit that the bill should be amended by substituting for the 12 cents a pound rate the one which has been tested and found satisfactory in the United Kingdom.

The bill further provides for the receipt as mail of all parcels within the limit along the rural routes, but it limits the carriage and delivery of such parcels to points on the same route on which it is received, and this limitation robs the provision of its chief value.

In the beginning of my remarks I pointed out the fact that the chief business of the world consists in the interchange of agricultural and manufactured products, that the principal function of commerce is to effect this interchange, and that transportation is indispensable to the accomplishment of this object. I have also shown that in this transportation the discrimination of the railroad and express companies against the small parcels of merchandise is one of the evils which the parcel post will remedy and that in order to effect this object the bill should be amended so as to raise the weight limit from 11 to 100 pounds and so as to reduce the rate from 12 cents to about 3 cents a pound. While if all this were done it would remedy the first evil mentioned, yet it would have no tendency to remedy the other evil in transportation, which has no connection whatever in either the express or railroad business with the rural population. A parcel post that does not connect the factory with the farm, that does not put the consumer of the city in touch with the producer of the country, and that limits the carriage and delivery of parcels received on a rural route to points on the same route fails to recognize the evil to be remedied and of course fails to provide the needful remedy. If we take any rural route in the United States, it is safe to say that every community along said route is so much alike every other community on the same route in its productions and in its wants that there is practically no demand in one for what the other has to sell, and that therefore the facility for the interchange of products among the communities on the same rural route provided by the bill will be of little use. Indeed, the only advantage from the rural parcel post provided in the bill would be to facilitate trade between people living along the same route and those living in some business center on the route. But so far as the main object of a parcel post is concerned, which is to make possible the interchange of the products of the farm and factory produced or sold in small parcels, the bill as written will never accomplish the object and should be amended so as to provide for the carriage and delivery of parcels to any point within the United States without any reference to whether it was posted in a city or on a rural route.

The general economic effect of a parcel post in facilitating the interchange of agricultural and manufactured products, in stimulating and increasing the products of the farms, and in the restoration of competition and in giving some relief to the high cost of living have been explained as fully as time will permit, but in conclusion I wish to point out the effect of a parcel post upon the country merchant and the traveling man and to show why a parcel post will injure and destroy neither of them.

Without a parcel post there is but one line of passage that all manufactured goods must take from the factory to the consumer, and that is the line of freight in carload lots to the centers of trade, whence this class of merchandise finds its way in wagons to the country merchant, who disposes of them to the consumer. All merchandise, except a small fractional part shipped as parcels, takes this course, and when it reaches the country merchant it is burdened with all the charges which the jobber, the wholesale merchant, the banker, and the trans-

portation companies have placed upon it; and all these burdens must be included by the country merchant in the price at which he sells to the consumer. He is helpless to make them less, since there is only one channel in which he can purchase, and he is shielded by no competition. The parcel post would give the country merchant a new avenue of trade and enable him to buy at least a portion of his goods direct from the factory. The very power to do this, whether largely exercised or not, would protect him from the exactions of monopoly and increase his independence. It would enable him, without decreasing his profits, to sell to his patrons at cheaper prices. When his country customers thus get their goods at more reasonable prices on account of the competition engendered, and when they are enabled to send to market what is now wasted for want of transportation, the improved condition of his customers will manifest itself in the increased trade of the country merchant, for you can not improve the condition of his customers without improving his.

The idea that the parcel post will ruin the country merchant and drive him out of business means that, instead of the transportation of about 5,000,000 tons of merchandise in small parcels, as at present, there would be diverted from the channels of freight more than a billion tons of merchandise and forced through the mails, a result too absurd for anyone to believe who understands the subject.

If the parcel post should begin to divert any considerable portion of merchandise from its passage through the jobber, wholesaler, and railroad companies as freight, the economic effect would be such a decrease in the price at the factory, of the profits of the jobber and wholesaler, and of the freights of the transportation companies as to maintain the present mercantile order; and between these agents of commerce on the one hand and the catalogue houses and parcel post on the other there would be a wholesome competition beneficial to his patrons, and consequently to the country merchant. What reason suggests is demonstrated by experience. In all countries where the parcel post has been tried it has benefited the country merchant as well as his country customers. On the 24th of August, 1911, the Secretary of State addressed a circular letter to our diplomatic officers throughout the world, in which information was requested upon this point—as to whether shopkeepers in small towns claim that the parcel post militates against them and in favor of the large departmental or city stores. The answers to the question, covering a printed volume of 320 pages, show conclusively not only that the parcel post does not injure or destroy the country merchant, but that the only country on earth where the great mail-order houses exist and flourish is the United States. It looks as if the absence of a parcel post is what causes these mail-order houses to spring into existence. They seem to be a sort of economic protest against the exorbitant prices and monopolistic burdens which characterize trade in the absence of a parcel post. If the parcel post will not injure but benefit the country merchant, it follows that the need for the services of the traveling man will not be lessened. [Applause.]

Mr. SAMUEL W. SMITH. Will the gentleman yield? I am very much interested in what the gentleman said, and I want to ask him a question, purely for information. I assume the gentleman is in favor of a general parcel post?

Mr. WITHERSPOON. Surely.

Mr. SAMUEL W. SMITH. Is it the gentleman's judgment, if Congress should pass a general parcel post and we should adjourn by July 1 that the Government is now in shape to take care of a parcel post carrying packages of 100 pounds?

Mr. WITHERSPOON. To the details of it and the administration of it I must confess I have given very little attention. I would not like to express any opinion about that, because I have not studied it. I have discussed the questions that I have studied. I do not think my opinion on these other matters would really be worth expressing.

Mr. SAMUEL W. SMITH. What I am getting at is whether or not, if we pass a general parcel-post bill, carrying packages up to as large as 100 pounds, we should give it immediate effect or effect in six months or a year or a year and a half or now.

Mr. WITHERSPOON. Those would be important questions for the man who drew the bill to consider.

Mr. SAMUEL W. SMITH. We will have to pass on these questions, I assume, in the next week.

Mr. WITHERSPOON. We can not pass on that in this bill.

Mr. SAMUEL W. SMITH. I do not say we are going to pass this bill, but whatever we do pass respecting a parcel post I assume we will pass within the next week.

Mr. WEEKS. Mr. Chairman, I yield to the gentleman from Washington [Mr. LA FOLLETTE].



Mr. LA FOLLETTE. Mr. Chairman, I am heartily in favor of some of the special provisions of this bill, and especially so of that one fixing the hours of labor that shall constitute a day's work for letter carriers in the City Delivery Service and clerks in first and second class offices and making provisions to pay them for any overtime they serve. Such a law is only fair and just. I am not only in favor of this clause in this bill, but am equally anxious to see the enactment of laws that will compel strictly just treatment of all employees of the various departments of the postal service.

The postal employee receives the least compensation for the grade of service he performs of any class on the Government pay rolls. He must possess more than average intelligence and strength, because his work is a constant physical and mental test. To ask him to work more than eight hours without extra pay and under a rule which forbids both petition and protest is a decided injustice and is only one of the few bureaucratic proceedings of the Post Office Department that need amending.

#### PARCEL-POST PROVISION INADEQUATE.

The provisions made in this bill for a parcel post on rural routes I consider far from adequate, but if enacted will be of great benefit to the patrons and residents along these routes.

I think the charges are higher than need be and the limit of weight much smaller than need be for the best good of both those served and those performing the service on strictly rural routes, with the service confined only to the line on which business originates. Two years ago, when I announced myself as a candidate for Congress, I was asked to express my views on the parcel-post question, and I went on record as approving parcel post on rural routes and experimental parcel post for general service. Since I have been a Member of Congress I have given some thought and research to the question of a general parcel post. I have made a study of the service abroad, and while it varies in the several countries of Europe and has a wide range as to both character of service and rates charged, I have not been able to find a single country where the system has not been beneficial or where any injury has resulted to business in either town or country from the parcel system. Invariably the reverse is conceded, and nothing but protest would follow any attempt to abrogate its functions in any country where it has been established.

#### EXPRESS COMPANIES THIEVES ON THE HIGHWAY.

We hear continually the cry from the rural districts that a parcel-post system means disaster and ruin to the country merchant; that it would largely increase the amounts of money that would be sent from the town to the cities, and consequently the small places would decay and perish and we would soon have no interurban villages and towns, but all would be city and country, hence the cry "Wolf!" "Wolf!" And pressure has been brought to bear for years on the Members of Congress from the organized mercantile interests of the country, from the boards of trade of our various towns, and from almost everybody who could be prevailed on to protest against a parcel-post measure, except the one great factor in the fight which has all to lose and nothing to gain by a parcel-post system—the great express companies of the country—who have stood, like thieves on the highway, and exacted tribute from the people of this great country without giving any adequate return. Of all the abuses that have been allowed to grow up and receive the fostering care of this Government they have been the most rapacious. They are a fungous growth on the "right of eminent domain" exercised by railroads and other transportation companies, parasites that have attached themselves to our railroad and boat systems and are exacting prices for carrying the less bulky products of our country—hence often the more valuable—that are not justifiable by any sense of justice or by any principle of proportion, but are exercised by greed and extortion, backed up by the complacent and dilatory failure of our various legislative bodies, both State and National, to bring them to account.

I say they are back of the entire opposition to a parcel post. They work on the wholesale merchant to prod the retailer. They point out how this is going to help the great city merchants, like Sears, Roebuck & Co., Montgomery, Ward & Co., John Smyth, Albers & Co., and others. If we will analyze the claims made of damages that are to accrue to the country merchant, we will find that they overlook the fact that the individuals who are getting the benefit of parcel-post rates have, of a necessity, got to buy at retail and the country merchant could, if he would, ship goods in by parcel post, furnish the same to the customer, and make the difference between the wholesale and the retail price in Chicago or elsewhere.

#### IMPROVED CONDITIONS FOR MERCHANT AND CUSTOMER.

It would no doubt cause him to sell for a less profit than he is compelled to charge under the present system, but that would

be offset by increased trade and mutual betterment of himself and customer. There is not a tenable argument made against a parcel post. The benefits in every country tried has demonstrated the fallacy of all such argument. One proof of the claim I make that the express companies are the instigators of all arguments against the system is the fact that the most persistent protests against a parcel post comes from implement dealers, hardware merchants, lumber dealers, and those interests that would have least to lose by a parcel-post system, on account of the heavy character of their commodities. These are the ones who are flooding Congress with protests. Why? Because the Weyerhaeusers, who control the lumber interests, are also interested in railways and express companies; likewise the International Harvester Co., which paid the largest dividends and showed the greatest earning capacity of any concern in the United States in 1910.

Their millionaire founders are connected with transportation, express, and other corporations and throw their influence to defeat a measure that, if rightfully framed and administered, would kill a goose that has probably laid more golden eggs and paid greater profits in proportion to capital invested in the business than any other in America. The great express business and these special interests—the Weyerhaeusers, International Harvester Trust, the great railroads, Morgan, Hill, Rockefellers, and all—feel that not only this particular business in which they are interested must be protected, but they have to check all such legislation or it might lead to more that would benefit the masses and injure their control.

It is an easy matter to sit back and pull the strings that put all the machinery to work, to have their various agents flood the Members of Congress with protests against the measure. They send out arguments by the yard for their agents to use, and through them the country banker, the boards of trade, the principal politicians, any and every body that can be induced to do so on the plea of injury to business, are asked to write or wire their Congressman to help kill the measure. This is all done so that the express companies of the country, with an actual capital of a few millions of dollars, can clean up an annual profit of more than 100 per cent on the capital actually invested.

#### SPECIAL INTERESTS BACK OF OPPOSITION.

Mr. Chairman, I have said that when I came to Congress I was in favor of a rural parcel post, and further than that, an experimental parcel post to demonstrate the advisability of a general parcel-post system to be established on the principle of the greatest good to the greatest number of our people. Since I have come here, however, and have studied the question, have made note of the interests that were responsible for most of the opposition, and realize that it is the beneficiary of our present system, the express companies, and back of them the leaders of all the great special interests of the country, I am ready to vote for a parcel-post system that will give to the 95,000,000 people in this country a service equal to the best provided by any other civilized country, and am willing to go further and give them a better one than any other country enjoys—one that will make the distribution of by-products and the small commodities of farm and field, of village and hamlet, of city and town, possible, and add to the incomes of the people thereby and make possible a substantial reduction in the cost of living. I fully agree with the gentleman from Maryland [Mr. LEWIS] that all parcel-post measures so far advocated are inadequate, and I heartily indorse his ideas of a postal express.

There are only two things standing in the way of proper legislation at the present time—lack of knowledge and fear.

Legislators and Congressmen and candidates for legislatures and Congress are afraid to act and declare themselves in the face of the protests from the press, the merchants, the lumbermen, and organized interests of the country against it, even though they know the unorganized masses are in favor of and would be benefited thereby. In a measure, they are justified, for they can only judge by the past, and they know those who have failed to heed the demands of the former have almost invariably been consigned to the "scrap heap," and it takes courage to stand firm for the people in the face of such experiences.

#### HOPE TO VOTE FOR PARCEL POST OR POSTAL EXPRESS.

Mr. Chairman, I hope before this Congress finally adjourns we will have a chance to go on record for a parcel-post or a postal-express bill that will give to the people of this country the best service possible, and I shall heartily work and vote for the same. The character of the fight against a parcel post can well be measured by one sentiment expressed by the opponents as explained in the report of the committee on this bill. They quoted the opponents to a parcel-post system as saying

they were against a rural parcel-post system, for the reason that it was an "entering wedge that might lead to a general parcel post." There is supreme selfishness for you. There is the nerve of special privilege. There is unlimited gall. Advocates or opponents of a measure that would use an expression of that kind show a smallness of soul and a dimness of vision that should be characterized as unfair, unpatriotic, and un-American, and totally against the rights of mankind.

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. MOON of Tennessee. Mr. Chairman, I believe there are no other gentlemen who desire to speak this evening. If anyone desires time, I will be glad to yield to him.

Mr. TURNBULL. Mr. Chairman, I will ask the gentleman to yield to me.

Mr. MOON of Tennessee. I yield 30 minutes to the gentleman from Virginia.

Mr. TURNBULL. Mr. Chairman, the President of the United States, in his message delivered to the Senate and House of Representatives on the 22d day of February, 1912, uses the following language:

In transmitting the annual report of the Postmaster General for the fiscal year ended June 30, 1911, it gives me pleasure to call attention to the fact that the revenues for the fiscal year ended June 30, 1911, amounted to \$237,879,823.60 and that the expenditures amounted to \$237,660,705.48, making a surplus of \$219,118.12. For the year ended June 30, 1909, the postal service was in arrears to the extent of \$17,479,770.47. In the interval this very large deficit has been changed into a surplus, and that without the curtailment of postal facilities.

I desire to take issue with the President in this last statement, and will undertake to show that, in my judgment, the postal facilities in my district have not only been curtailed, but that the service has not been extended in the manner that the convenience of the people of my district required and they had a right under the law to demand. In this connection I desire to say in advance that I have no complaint to make of the postal authorities, from the First Assistant Postmaster General all the way down the line, who are charged with the active duty of executing the laws, for they have, without exception, treated me with the utmost courtesy and kindness, and I believe would have complied with the petitions of my people for better service if they could have done so consistently with instructions which, I believe, they received from persons having authority over them.

Now, Mr. Chairman, in order that the points I will make may be made clear, I desire to call attention to the laws putting into effect the Rural Free Delivery System, which were enacted for the benefit of the people in rural communities so that they could have better and more convenient mail facilities.

On the 1st day of October, 1890, a joint resolution was passed providing—

That the Postmaster General be enabled to test at small towns and villages the practicability and expense of extending the free-delivery service to offices of the third and fourth class, and other offices now embraced within the free delivery, said test to be made on the petition of the patrons and in the discretion of the Postmaster General, the sum of \$10,000, which sum shall be taken from the amount appropriated for the free-delivery service for the year ending June 30, 1891, and shall be applied to the payment of carriers for one hour or two hours per day as may be necessary for the convenience of the public and advantage of the postal service, said pay to be fixed by the Postmaster General at the rates per hour not exceeding the present maximum rates for pay of carriers.

Nothing was done under this law because the then Postmaster General reported that to establish such service was impracticable.

On March 3, 1893, the following clause was included in the Post Office appropriation bill:

For free-delivery service, including existing experiment free-delivery offices, \$11,254,900, of which the sum of \$10,000 shall be applied, under the direction of the Postmaster General, to experimental free delivery in rural communities other than towns and villages.

After this, as I understand it, for each year there was included in each Post Office appropriation bill a sum for experimental work in rural free delivery which gradually increased each year until 1902, when the service was classified, division headquarters established, inspectors, special agents, route inspectors, and so forth, were directed to be appointed, and the amount appropriated for this purpose was gradually increased until, as we have it under the present bill, about \$43,000,000 is appropriated for the purpose of keeping in effect the Rural Free Delivery Service.

It will be observed that the joint resolution applied to small towns and villages and directed the Postmaster General, in his discretion, to appoint carriers by the hour, and so forth. In the act of 1893 he was positively directed to expend the sum of \$10,000 in trying experiments in regard to rural delivery in country districts other than towns and villages. Under this law the Postmaster General prescribed the rules and regulations

by which these routes were to be established, which provided, as required by law, that they should be established upon the petition of families along the proposed route and specifying that where the routes were 24 miles in length 100 families should sign, and where shorter routes were applied for a lesser number of families were required. In the establishment of these routes the post offices along the routes were abolished, so that when application was made for the establishment of a rural route there was generally a controversy between the parties who desired the establishment of the route and the postmasters, and in cases where all united for the establishment of a route under this regulation it was pretty good evidence that the convenience of the public demanded that the rural route should be established in accordance with the law and the discretion given the Postmaster General in such cases was at an end.

When I came into the House, in 1910, I found that a number of these petitions that had been filed had been referred to an inspector, recommended by him, and approved by the department. In order that the matter may be understood, I want to refer to the letters that I have received in one case, so as to show the condition of things in reference to these rural routes in my district. I was sworn in on the 16th of March, 1910, and on that very day I received a letter from the judge of my circuit, saying that he had written at the request of a large number of people who were interested in the establishment of two of the routes mentioned, and requested me to examine into the matter and have the routes established as soon as possible. I at once communicated with the Fourth Assistant Postmaster General, and on March 30, 1910, I received a letter from him in which he uses the following language:

Noting your inquiry as to the status of the case, you are advised that a favorable report on the route in question has been received and approved; but, owing to the existing condition of the finances of the Government and the consequent necessity for strict economy in all branches of the public service, it is deemed advisable, after careful consideration, to defer further installation of rural delivery for the present, except where necessary to maintain the efficiency of the service in operation or where the establishment of new service seems imperatively required to meet demands which can not be met by means of existing facilities.

After the appropriation bill for 1911 was passed, I again called the attention of the Postmaster General to the necessity of establishing these routes, and I went to the department several times in regard thereto, and was informed that one of the routes had been refused upon the ground that it conflicted with established star-route service, but that the other would be put in operation as soon as possible.

I afterwards went to the section of my district where these routes were proposed to be established and heard the complaints of the people who were interested, some stating that they had to travel 4 or 5 miles to get their mail. I then wrote a letter to the Post Office Department, calling attention to the want of mail facilities in these sections and the necessity of establishing the routes applied for, and received a letter from the Fourth Assistant Postmaster General, dated November 15, 1911, in which he says:

With reference to your letter of recent date urging early action toward the establishment of these routes, I beg to advise that the cases have been referred to a representative of the department for investigation. The chief inspector will be advised of your desire that the investigation be expedited, and upon receipt of the reports the matter will be given further attention.

I then took the matter up with the chief inspector and requested him to examine into the matter, and I have a letter from him, dated December 14, 1911, in which he says:

Referring to the personal call of your secretary at this office to-day, I have to state that this office does not have a record of a case outstanding for investigation of the rural service at the point mentioned.

I then wrote to the inspector and called his attention to the fact that these routes had been pending for years and referred him to the letter from the Postmaster General dated November 15, 1911, in which he stated that the matter had been referred to the chief inspector, and I received a letter from him in reply, in which he says:

Referring to my letter of the 14th instant and yours of the 15th, relative to the investigation of conditions at Wakefield, Va., looking toward the installation of rural service at that point, I beg to state that further search of the records of this office indicates that there is such an investigation pending in the hands of an inspector, and he has this day been directed to give it attention as early as practicable consistent with the handling of other important cases which he may have in hand.

I have been to the department a number of times since that time in reference to the routes mentioned, as well as a number of others that I have not referred to, where the same conditions exist, and the only information that I have been able to receive was that the matters were being investigated and I would be informed later as to the result, and none of these old routes applied for, as indicated, have been established, and I have been unable to get any positive information as to whether they ever would be established or not. A number of petitions for rural



routes in my district have been filed by me since I came into Congress, and they are still pending, and nothing has been done toward granting the people the service that the conditions in the sections from which the petitions were filed demand. I do not say that no routes have been established in my district, because I think that one short route was put in operation, and possibly one other, but if any others have been established my attention has not been called to it. In every instance where routes have been applied for they were promptly turned down where investigation showed that to establish the routes would in any way interfere with the star-route service, so I think I have a right to presume that the applications applied for which have not been turned down are in proper shape and that the convenient service to the people required that they be put in force, and that to investigate and approve them, and then to order a reinvestigation and inspection, is nothing but a subterfuge and an excuse for delay. This is the condition of things in my district, so far as the establishment of rural routes is concerned.

About 12 months or more ago inspectors were sent throughout my district, and a number of postmasters were notified that their positions would be made vacant at a time named because they had violated some trivial rules of the department, and these post offices, in a number of instances, had been established at points where it was impossible to get any person that would receive the appointment of postmaster in the place of those who were removed, and the consequence is that on one star route not far from my home there is no post office for a distance of more than 10 miles, and the patrons along this star route have to rely on the carrier to deliver their mail, for which they have to pay individually, and when an application was made to establish an office at one place along this route I was informed by the department that an inspector had been sent there and had reported that there was no necessity for the office. In other instances the post offices were discontinued and the entire service to the people in the sections abandoned and they had to go for long distances to get their mail, and when application was made for the establishment of other post offices in the section it was with the utmost difficulty that arrangements could be made to establish these post offices and get some one to carry the mail at all, as they were established temporarily and a carrier secured upon a doubtful salary, receiving an amount not exceeding the receipts of the offices along the route.

Another thing I desire to call attention to: There are three great trunk lines of railroad that pass through my district, going from Norfolk, Va., to the west, the Norfolk & Western, the Virginian, and the Southern; and on the Norfolk & Western the town of Blackstone, which is 140 miles from Norfolk, is the market town for a lot of people who live in the country, not only between the Norfolk & Western Railway and the Virginian in the direction of Dundas on the Virginian Railway, but beyond that point, the distance between Blackstone and Dundas being about 20 miles.

There is a star route that runs out from Blackstone in the direction of Dundas and ends at a place called Lochleven, which is about 14 miles from Blackstone, and there is also a route running out from Dundas on the Virginian Railway in the direction of Blackstone to a point called Gig, about 2½ miles, leaving a gap in the route between Gig and Lochleven of about 3½ miles. The people in this section have made application to the Post Office Department to have the route from Dundas to Gig extended to Lochleven, or the one from Blackstone to Lochleven extended to Gig, so that the people around Dundas and between Gig and Lochleven could have direct communication with their market town, Blackstone, and this was refused, and the result is that the people at Blackstone who desire to communicate with their patrons at Dundas and that section have to write letters that travel from Blackstone to Norfolk, Va., 140 miles over the Norfolk & Western Railway, and then from Norfolk up to Dundas on the Virginian Railway, which is likewise about the same distance, taking about two days, instead of having this short route established there, so that they could communicate with their market town every day. Another instance I cite is that not long since an inspector was sent to Petersburg, a city in my district of 25,000 inhabitants, to examine into the letter-carrier service in that city, and he recommended that one of the mounted carriers be dispensed with, which was done, and, as a consequence, one section of the city which had received two deliveries of mail a day for 20 years now receives only one.

There is another thing that I desire to call attention to, and that is the appointment of postmasters in my district. If the question was asked of any Member of Congress outside of our section as to how these postmasters are appointed, I am satisfied that he would reply that the appointments were made upon the application of a majority of the patrons of the various offices—that is, not only a majority of the patrons themselves,

but of those who receive and send out the largest quantity of mail received and sent out from the offices—when such is not the fact at all, for the patrons of the office are allowed no voice, as a general thing, in the selection of postmasters at all, for they are appointed upon the recommendation of some person who dispenses the Federal patronage of my district upon the recommendation of a referee, appointed by somebody, no one knows who. I cite one instance in which 800 citizens of a county recommended the appointment of a postmaster at a certain town, and every citizen of the town, Republicans and Democrats, white folks and negroes, with the exception of one or two, made application for the appointment of a certain party as postmaster; but the Postmaster General sent to the President for appointment the name of a party who was recommended by a very few of the citizens but had the indorsement of the dispenser of patronage and the referee, and the nomination was sent to the Senate by the President, and when he was appealed to by the citizens of the town to withdraw the nomination so made, he replied, through his secretary, that after a conference with the Postmaster General he felt that he could not withdraw the nomination that had been sent to the Senate. But for reasons appearing to the Senate Committee on Post Offices and Post Roads, to whom the matter was referred, the nomination was not confirmed, and nothing further has been done about it since January, 1911.

Mr. SISSON. Is the gentleman who was not confirmed by the Senate still holding the office?

Mr. TURNBULL. No; he never got the office because the office is still being held by the one who performed the duties of it. An effort is always made where possible to appoint Republicans to these offices, and I want to say that a Republican in my district is a flower that is rare and only blooms out once in four years and that is when a presidential election is coming on, and one of the peculiar characteristics of this flower is that between times it sometimes changes its hue and is apt to vote in a Democratic primary. As every presidential election comes on you will hear a great deal of talk about instructions being sent out calling attention to the immense penalties that will be inflicted by the Postmaster General unless the political activity of postmasters stops, when it looks to me as if the Postmaster General merely talks in reference to these instructions and predicts these dire punishments, and the referee above referred to comes along and lets it be known that unless they stand by the party in power they will lose their heads.

I have felt it a duty that I owe to myself and to my constituents to call attention to the facts I have mentioned as to the lack of postal facilities in my section, because my people seem to think that I ought to have some influence in having postal facilities granted them. Unfortunately for my section of Virginia we have a great deal of uncultivated land, and an effort is being made to induce immigrants from the West and other sections of the United States to come into our section of the country, and one of the main reasons that prevents them from doing this is because of the lack of mail facilities. I am impressed with the fact that my people have not been fairly dealt with, and there seems no redress except to bring the matter to the attention of this House, believing that some scheme may be devised by which relief may be granted them.

Mr. SISSON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TURNBULL. Certainly.

Mr. SISSON. Mr. Chairman, I want to state to the gentleman from Virginia that he is not the only Member of Congress who has had the trouble of which he speaks; but since the economy orders went into effect, and the Postmaster General has claimed that he has saved some money, I desire to say that he has saved it in my district by virtually destroying the mail system in many sections of the district. I have one situation in Calhoun County, in my district, which makes the evils of which the gentleman complains seem very mild in comparison. I speak of one office especially. I have taken the matter up repeatedly with the Fourth Assistant Postmaster General and have failed to get relief, and I have the promise of the chairman of the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads of the House that he will go down with the Representative of the fourth district of Mississippi and see if he can induce the Post Office authorities to give the people down there some mail facilities.

I want to state for myself that I have had perhaps as much trouble as the gentleman from Virginia, but my constituents have been just as insistent as his have been, and rightfully so, but I am sure that the fault does not lie at his door any more than at my own in my case. I am sure that it does not lie at my door, because Congress did all that it could do to sustain the Rural Mail Service throughout the country, and over the protest of the Postmaster General, who wanted the right to displace the rural routes with the star routes. Congress speci-

cally voted his recommendation down by an overwhelming vote. My recollection is that he got it put on the bill in the Senate, and it came back to the House and the House stood solidly by the rural-mail system, and the gentleman from Virginia, my recollection is, voted with us on the proposition. In conference, my recollection is, the Senate receded, and \$1,500,000 was appropriated for the purpose of extending this service. My recollection is that the Postmaster General endeavored to have the \$350,000 covered back into the Treasury. Is that true, I will ask the gentleman from Tennessee?

Mr. MOON of Tennessee. About that.

Mr. Sisson. About \$350,000, and he had declined deliberately to carry out the will of Congress by declining to use it as the law said he should use it, so he had about \$1,850,000, and he willfully declined to use this money as the law directed and has permitted the people to suffer hardships and inconvenience by so doing.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Virginia has expired.

Mr. TURNBULL. Mr. Chairman, I would like to have about five minutes more.

Mr. MOON of Tennessee. Mr. Chairman, I yield five minutes more to the gentleman from Virginia.

Mr. TURNBULL. Mr. Chairman, I simply wanted to state, in reference to what has been stated by my friend from Mississippi, that it is a comfort always to know that there are others who are having the same trouble that you are.

Mr. MOON of Tennessee. Mr. Chairman, I move that the committee do now rise.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the committee rose; and the Speaker having resumed the chair, Mr. SAUNDERS, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union, reported that that committee had had under consideration the bill H. R. 21279, the Post Office appropriation bill, and had come to no resolution thereon.

#### ADJOURNMENT.

Mr. MOON of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 10 o'clock and 39 minutes p. m.) the House adjourned to meet to-morrow, Saturday, April 13, 1912, at 12 o'clock noon.

#### EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS.

Under clause 2 of Rule XXIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

1. A letter from the Secretary of the Interior, transmitting detailed report of expenditures of money carried on the books of the Department of the Interior under the caption of "Indian moneys, proceeds of labor," during the fiscal year ending June 30, 1911 (H. Doc. No. 695); to the Committee on Indian Affairs and ordered to be printed.

2. A letter from the Acting Secretary of the Treasury, transmitting copy of a communication from the Secretary of the Interior, submitting estimate of appropriation to reimburse the German ambassador for expenses incurred by him in obtaining information for the Interior Department (H. Doc. No. 696); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

#### REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS.

Under clause 2 of Rule XIII, bills and resolutions were severally reported from committees, delivered to the Clerk, and referred to the several calendars therein named, as follows:

Mr. LAMB, from the Committee on Agriculture, to which was referred the bill (H. R. 22952) providing that the United States in certain cases shall make compensation for the use of highways for carrying rural mail, reported the same with amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 538), which said bill and report were referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. RICHARDSON, from the Committee on Pensions, to which was referred the bill (H. R. 18434) to repeal section 4716 of the Revised Statutes of the United States, reported the same with amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 540), which said bill and report were referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. ANDERSON of Ohio, from the Committee on the District of Columbia, to which was referred the bill (S. 2904) to confer upon the Commissioners of the District of Columbia authority to regulate the operation and equipment of the vehicles of the Metropolitan Coach Co., reported the same with amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 541), which said bill and report

were referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. HAMLIN, from the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, to which was referred the bill (H. R. 21590) to authorize levee and drainage district No. 25, of Dunklin County, Mo., to construct and maintain a levee across a branch or cut-off of St. Francis River, in Missouri, reported the same with amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 539), which said bill and report were referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. PROUTY, from the Committee on the District of Columbia, to which was referred the bill (H. R. 22643) to amend subchapter 2, chapter 19, of the Code of Law for the District of Columbia, by providing a penalty for willful omission to return library property in the District of Columbia, reported the same without amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 542), which said bill and report were referred to the House Calendar.

He also, from the same committee, to which was referred the bill (H. R. 22912) regulating lobbying and preventing employees of the Government of the United States and the District of Columbia from raising funds for lobbying purposes, reported the same with amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 543), which said bill and report were referred to the House Calendar.

#### REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS.

Under clause 2 of Rule XIII.

Mr. PEPPER, from the Committee on Military Affairs, to which was referred the bill (H. R. 22939) for the relief of John K. Wren, reported the same with amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 536), which said bill and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

#### PUBLIC BILLS, RESOLUTIONS, AND MEMORIALS.

Under clause 3 of Rule XXII, bills, resolutions, and memorials were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. NORRIS: A bill (H. R. 23236) to provide for a primary nominating election in the District of Columbia, at which the qualified electors of the said District shall have the opportunity to vote for their first and second choice among those aspiring to be candidates of their respective political parties for President and Vice President of the United States, to elect their party delegates to their national conventions, and to elect their national committeemen; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. TAYLOR of Colorado: A bill (H. R. 23237) appropriating \$7,500 to be used by the Forest Service in the construction of a highway to connect Cottonwood Lakes in the Battlement National Forest with a system of roads now being constructed in Plateau Valley, Colo., by the State of Colorado and citizens of Mesa County, in that State; to the Committee on Agriculture.

Also, a bill (H. R. 23238) to authorize the issuance of absolute and unqualified patents to public lands in certain cases; to the Committee on the Public Lands.

By Mr. RAKER: A bill (H. R. 23239) appropriating money for the purpose of carrying out and enforcing the provisions of "An act to further regulate interstate and foreign commerce by prohibiting the transportation therein for immoral purposes of women and girls, and for other purposes," approved June 25, 1910; to the Committee on Appropriations.

By Mr. COX of Ohio: A bill (H. R. 23240) to regulate the employment of minor children in the District of Columbia; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. REDFIELD (by request): A bill (H. R. 23241) to promote the efficiency of the customs service and to establish the customs guards; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. KINKAID of Nebraska: A bill (H. R. 23242) to authorize the granting of patent after three years on homestead entries made under the reclamation act; to the Committee on Irrigation of Arid Lands.

By Mr. FOWLER: A bill (H. R. 23243) providing for the increase of compensation and wages of the officers, employees, and servants in the various departments of the United States Government; to the Committee on Reform in the Civil Service.

By Mr. DUPRE (by request): A bill (H. R. 23244) to regulate practice in the courts of the United States, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also (by request), a bill (H. R. 23245) to prohibit United States judges exercising judicial powers outside the places where the court holds its sessions by law, and to create standing masters, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.



By Mr. WICKLIFFE: A bill (H. R. 23246) appropriating \$150,000 for the purpose of maintaining and protecting against the impending flood the levees on the Mississippi River and rivers tributary thereto; to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors.

By Mr. JONES: A bill (H. R. 23247) providing for the improvement of the roadway from the railroad depot at Fredericksburg, Va., to the national cemetery near Fredericksburg; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. PEPPER: A bill (H. R. 23284) to authorize the Great Northern Development Co. to construct a dam across the Mississippi River from a point in Scott County, Iowa, to a point in Rock Island County, Ill.; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. SLEMP: Resolution (H. Res. 491) to create a committee on public highways; to the Committee on Rules.

#### PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS.

Under clause 1 of Rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. ADAIR: A bill (H. R. 23248) granting an increase of pension to Martin Murphy; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 23249) granting an increase of pension to Robert L. Kirkwood; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 23250) granting an increase of pension to Henry Eller; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. BORLAND: A bill (H. R. 23251) for the relief of Elizabeth S. Lewerenz; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 23252) for the relief of the estate of William Morrison; to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee: A bill (H. R. 23253) to compensate G. W. Wall, of Cheatham County, Tenn., for damages sustained by him on account of the construction of Lock and Dam A on the lower Cumberland River; to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 23254) to compensate J. E. Stewart, of Cheatham County, Tenn., for damages sustained by him on account of the construction of Lock and Dam A on the lower Cumberland River; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. CARY: A bill (H. R. 23255) to place on the retired list the name of Aaron I. Comfort; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. COOPER: A bill (H. R. 23256) for the relief of S. O. Onsgard; to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. DENVER: A bill (H. R. 23257) granting an increase of pension to William Yates; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 23258) granting an increase of pension to John W. Armstrong; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 23259) granting an increase of pension to Alonzo Judd; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. DOUGHTON: A bill (H. R. 23260) for the relief of W. H. Carter; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. FLOYD of Arkansas: A bill (H. R. 23261) granting an increase of pension to Lovina P. Simmons; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. FOSTER: A bill (H. R. 23262) for the relief of Martha Black; to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. HARTMAN: A bill (H. R. 23263) granting an increase of pension to Alphonsus J. Bigham; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. HUGHES of Georgia: A bill (H. R. 23264) granting an increase of pension to John S. Lewis; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. JACOWAY: A bill (H. R. 23265) for the relief of the legal representatives of Wiley J. Davis, deceased; to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. LITTLEPAGE: A bill (H. R. 23266) for the relief of the legal representatives of M. M. Lawrence, deceased; to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. MORRISON: A bill (H. R. 23267) for the relief of Ambrose D. Hunt; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. NORRIS: A bill (H. R. 23268) granting an increase of pension to John Yonker; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. RAKER: A bill (H. R. 23269) granting an increase of pension to Morrison Hunter; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. RICHARDSON: A bill (H. R. 23270) granting a pension to Nancy Shelton; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. RUSSELL: A bill (H. R. 23271) granting an increase of pension to Isaiah Hilliard; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. SCULLY: A bill (H. R. 23272) granting an increase of pension to William S. De Hart; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. SHACKLEFORD: A bill (H. R. 23273) granting a pension to Mary E. Morgan; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. SULZER: A bill (H. R. 23274) granting an increase of pension to Charles M. Wyvell; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. TAYLOR of Colorado: A bill (H. R. 23275) granting an increase of pension to Adoniram J. R. Lohr; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. TOWNER: A bill (H. R. 23276) granting a pension to Jennie Todd; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. TRIBBLE: A bill (H. R. 23277) making an appropriation to pay the legal representatives of the estate of John H. Christy, deceased, to wit, E. J. Christy, Mary L. Christy, Sallie A. Christy, W. S. Christy, T. J. Christy, and Julia H. Bryson, and the estates of J. R. Christy, W. D. Christy, and H. P. Christy, heirs at law of John H. Christy, late of the State of Georgia, in full for any claim for salary and allowance made by reason of the election of the said John H. Christy to the Thirty-ninth Congress and his services therein; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. WHITE: A bill (H. R. 23278) granting a pension to Harry Remer; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 23279) granting a pension to Malinda E. S. Ballinger; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 23280) granting an increase of pension to Daniel L. Preston; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. WILSON of Illinois: A bill (H. R. 23281) granting a pension to Lozina L. Rozengrant; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 23282) granting a pension to Cory Huff; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. WILSON of New York: A bill (H. R. 23283) granting a pension to Edward A. Kohlberger; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. ADAIR: A bill (H. R. 23285) granting an increase of pension to Sarah M. Spence; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 23286) granting an increase of pension to Cyrus A. Moneysmith; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. LOBECK: A bill (H. R. 23287) granting an increase of pension to Emma Chapman; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

#### PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of Rule XXII, petitions and papers were laid on the Clerk's desk and referred as follows:

By Mr. ANDERSON of Minnesota: Petition of A. F. Liffbrig and 12 others, of Mazeppa, Minn., against extension of the parcel-post system; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

By Mr. AYRES: Memorial of the Chamber of Commerce of the State of New York, for amending the laws relating to navigation; to the Committee on the Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

Also, memorial of the Chamber of Commerce of the State of New York, relative to the operation of the Panama Canal; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. BURKE of South Dakota: Petition of residents of the State of South Dakota, for an amendment to the Constitution prohibiting the sale, manufacture for sale, and importation for sale of beverages containing alcohol; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BURKE of Wisconsin: Petition of the Turn Verein of Madison, Wis., against the passage of all prohibition or interstate-commerce liquor measures now pending; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

Also, petition of the Stadt-Verband of Racine, Wis., against the passage of all prohibition or interstate-commerce liquor measures now pending; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee: Papers to accompany bill to compensate J. E. Stewart, of Cheatham County, Tenn., for damage sustained to farm on account of construction of Lock and Dam A on the Cumberland River; to the Committee on Claims.

Also, papers to accompany bill to compensate G. W. Wall, of Cheatham County, Tenn., for damage sustained to farm on account of the construction of Lock and Dam A on the lower Cumberland River; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. CUNRY: Petition of homesteaders of Union County, N. Mex., urging passage of the extension of the Taylor-Borah homestead bill; to the Committee on the Public Lands.

By Mr. DANFORTH: Petitions of residents of the State of New York, protesting against parcel-post legislation; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

By Mr. FLOYD of Arkansas: Papers to accompany bill for the relief of Loyola P. Simmons; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. FULLER: Petition of American Cotton Manufacturers' Association, in opposition to proposed legislation concerning the sale and purchase of cotton, etc.; to the Committee on Agriculture.

Also, petition of Railway Mail Association, favoring the reclassification of salaries for railway postal clerks proviso in the Post Office appropriation bill; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

By Mr. HANNA: Petition of citizens of Bottineau County, N. Dak., favoring establishment of a parcel-post system; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

Also, petition of E. F. Dunton, of Ellendale, N. Dak., against extension of the parcel-post system; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

Also, petition of Westminster Presbyterian Church, of Devils Lake, N. Dak., for speedy passage of the Kenyon-Sheppard interstate liquor bill; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, petition of L. E. Yonaka, of Haynes, N. Dak., favoring a reduction in the duty on raw and refined sugars; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. LINDSAY: Petition of the Central Union Label Council of Greater New York, for the creation of a commission on industrial relations; to the Committee on Rules.

Also, petition of the Railway Mail Association, for a reclassification of salaries and a system of service promotion for railway postal clerks; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

Also, petition of the American Cotton Manufacturers' Association, in opposition to proposed legislation concerning the sale and purchase of cotton, etc.; to the Committee on Agriculture.

Also, memorial of the Order of Knights of Labor, relative to pending pension legislation for policemen and firemen of the District of Columbia; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. McCALL: Petition of Leslie F. Hunting Camp, No. 12, United Spanish War Veterans, of Cambridge, Mass., favoring passage of House bill 17470, which provides for the care of widows and orphans of deceased comrades of the Spanish War; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. MCCOY: Petition of the United Garment Workers of Houston, Tex., favoring passage of Booher prison-labor bill; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. McMORRAN: Petition of citizens of Owendale and Columbiaville, Mich., favoring the regulation of express rates; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

Also, petition of citizens of Lapeer, Mich., favoring passage of law for regulation of express rates; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

Also, petition of citizens of Columbiaville, Lapeer, and Owendale, Mich., favoring passage of parcel-post bill; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

Also, petition of citizens of St. Clair, Mich., protesting against any change in the oleomargarine law; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. RAKER: Petition of citizens of California, favoring House bill 21225, and protesting against House bill 20281; to the Committee on Agriculture.

Also, memorial of the Chamber of Commerce of the State of California, favoring the \$36,000 appropriation for fighting the Mediterranean fly; to the Committee on Agriculture.

Also, memorial of the Grand Parlor, Native Daughters of the Golden West, of California, to accompany House bill 12211, to acquire control by the United States of the Calaveras or Mammoth Grove of Big Trees; to the Committee on the Public Lands.

Also, memorial of the City Council of Berkeley, Cal., favoring the Bulkley 3-cent-piece bill; to the Committee on Coinage, Weights, and Measures.

Also, letter from the Bank of California, to accompany Senate bill 5735, to enable the President to propose and invite foreign governments to participate in an international conference to promote inquiry into causes of high cost of living throughout the world; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. REILLY: Petition of the American Cotton Manufacturers' Association, in opposition to proposed legislation concerning the sale and purchase of cotton, etc.; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. STEPHENS of California: Petitions of citizens of the State of California, for construction of one battleship in a Government navy yard; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

Also, petition of J. A. Beddison, of Palmdale, Cal., for parcel-post legislation; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

Also, petition of the Woman's Christian Temperance Union of Whittier, Cal., for passage of the Kenyon-Sheppard interstate liquor bill; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, petition of Benjamin H. Rentipohler, of Los Angeles, Cal., for enactment of House bill 20595, amending the copyright act of 1909; to the Committee on Patents.

Also, petition of the Southern California Wholesale Grocers' Association, for enactment of House bill 4667 and Senate bill 4727; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

Also, petition of residents of Los Angeles, Cal., for enactment of the Berger old-age pension bill; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. SULZER: Petition of the American Cotton Manufacturers' Association, in opposition to proposed legislation concerning the sale and purchase of cotton, etc.; to the Committee on Agriculture.

Also, memorial of the New York State delegation to the National Rivers and Harbors Congress, relative to development of waterways within the State of New York; to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors.

Also, petition of the Railway Mail Association, for reclassification of salaries and a system of promotions for railway postal clerks; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

Also, petition of C. A. Burrows, of Lancaster, Pa., favoring passage of old-age pension bill (H. R. 13114); to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. TOWNER: Petition of Swedish Baptist Church of Creston, Iowa, favoring the passage of the Kenyon-Sheppard interstate liquor bill; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. UNDERHILL: Petition of residents of the State of New York, against repeal of the anticanteen law; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. UTTER: Petition of Friends Society of East Greenwich, R. I., favoring passage of Kenyon-Sheppard interstate liquor bill; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. WHITE: Petition of citizens of Newport, Washington County, Ohio, favoring passage of parcel-post system; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

By Mr. WILLIS: Papers to accompany bill for the relief of Williamson T. Tway (H. R. 4639); to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. WILSON of New York: Petition of the American Cotton Manufacturers' Association, in opposition to proposed legislation concerning the sale and purchase of cotton, etc.; to the Committee on Agriculture.

Also, petition of residents of New York City, for enactment of House bill 14, providing for a general parcel-post system; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

By Mr. YOUNG of Texas: Petition of F. L. Moseley and other citizens of Murchison, Tex., favoring passage of parcel-post bill; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

## SENATE.

SATURDAY, April 13, 1912.

The Senate met at 2 o'clock p. m.

Prayer by the Chaplain, Rev. Ulysses G. B. Pierce, D. D.

The Journal of yesterday's proceedings was read and approved.

MOTOR AND OTHER VEHICLES IN GOVERNMENT SERVICE (S. DOC. NO. 558).

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate a communication from the Secretary of War, transmitting, in response to a resolution of the 25th ultimo, a statement showing the number of carriages, motor vehicles, etc., owned and operated by the Government and used by the War Department, which was referred to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

## PETITIONS AND MEMORIALS.

The VICE PRESIDENT presented petitions of the congregation of the Middle Smithfield Methodist Episcopal Church of Munroe County, Pa.; of the Ladies' Aid Society of the First Methodist Episcopal Church of Worcester, Mass.; of members of the Salvation Army of Worcester, Mass.; and of the congregation of the First Swedish Methodist Episcopal Church of Worcester, Mass., praying for the adoption of an amendment to the Constitution to prohibit the manufacture, sale, and importation of intoxicating liquors, which were referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

He also presented the memorial of A. A. Brenninger, of Washington, D. C., remonstrating against the proposed appropriation of \$215,000, reimbursable out of Indian funds, for the purpose of the survey, resurvey, classification, and appraisal of In-